The higher criticism in relation to the Pen
222.1 N229h 116659

Naville, Edouard Henri,
Life Pacific College Alumni Library

DATE DUE

222.1
N229h

Naville, Edouard Henri
The higher criticism in relation to the Pentateuch

MCO

E Pacific College
Alumni Library
0 West Covina Blvd.
n Dimas, CA 91773

THE HIGHER CRITICISM

IN RELATION TO

THE PENTATEUCH

THE HIGHER CRITICISM
IN RELATION TO
THE PENTATEUCH

BY

ÉDOUARD NAVILLE, D.C.L., LL.D, F.S.A.

Honorary Professor of the University of Geneva
Foreign Associate of the Institute of France

TRANSLATED, WITH AN INTRODUCTION, BY

REV. PROFESSOR JOHN R. MACKAY, M.A.

FOREWORD BY

SIR WILLIAM M. RAMSAY, D.C.L., LL.D., LITT.D.

EDINBURGH: T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET

1923

MADE AND PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
MORRISON AND GIBB LIMITED

FOR

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH

LONDON: SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT, AND CO. LIMITED
NEW YORK: CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

229h

L.I.F.E. College Library
1100 Glendale Blvd.
Los Angeles, Calif. 90026

FOREWORD

I BELIEVE that it would be a great service to education to translate Naville's recent reply to Humbert. Naville states the common-sense view of the possibilities of the case, in reply to the hostile argument: he states it with his abundant learning, guided by experience of life and of Eastern character and work.

It is a most important feature of his work that he recognises in all his thought that Moses was not a mere man of letters or historian, with leisure to devote to a work of literature, but a lawgiver and statesman, whose writing was subordinate to, and a means of aiding his daily and hourly task of leading and training a nation emerging from slavery, and of fitting them to deserve their position as the Chosen People. They were the Chosen People, because they proved able to produce the long succession of leaders and judges and prophets who distinguish and elevate Hebrew history. Moses made them so.

022935

At the same time, as Naville is writing an argument against a scholar, he assumes a knowledge of his published views; and this knowledge would need to be supplied by the translator for the benefit of the ordinary reader.

I know no book which is so much needed to correct and widen the narrow views of the modernist scholars, who treat law-books as if they were literary efforts, knowing nothing of the history and nature of law in their handling of the subject.

W. M. RAMSAY.

13 GREENHILL TERRACE,
EDINBURGH.

AUTHOR'S PREFACE

IN The Lausanne *Review of Theology and Philosophy*, No. 38, Professor Humbert of Neuchâtel wrote an Article in which he combated views concerning the Old Testament which for several years I have been maintaining. That Article, which does not lack in courtesy towards me personally, calls for an answer. I have thought that the best way to do this was to place the question in debate once again on its true footing, that of right method ; to show that in this domain there is another method besides that of the Higher Criticism, one that has as good a right as it to be called scientific ; that therefore the Higher Criticism can by no means claim a monopoly either of science or of truth. With this end in view, it became necessary to set down the two methods side by side, the one over against the other.

The objections raised by Mr. Humbert to my views are, for the most part, of the usual class ;

those which nearly all the Critics make to my viewpoint. As to those objections which are special to my present learned opponent, I reckon that I have cited them with sufficiency of detail to enable readers, that have not seen the Article in *The Review of Theology*, to understand their nature.

ÉDOUARD NAVILLE.

GENEVA.

AUTHOR'S PREFACE TO THE TRANSLATION

I HOPE the readers of this book, for the translation of which I am most grateful to the Rev. Prof. John R. Mackay, will understand the principle on which it rests, and which may best be summed up by this sentence of a German scholar speaking of Homer: "It is time to apply to Homer (I say Moses) the same principles which we are bound to apply to all other authors." And he adds, "whoever now cuts to pieces Horace or Juvenal or any of the Greek or Latin authors, finds no more credence; he is not listened to."

It is a fact that since the beginning of the twentieth century there has been a change in the way of considering ancient documents. Philology has ceased to rule our views. There are some great historical principles which apply to all ancient documents, whatever be the language in which they are written; and I have attempted in this book to show how Higher Criticism violates

those principles, to which it seems not to pay any attention. To those principles we are to submit in our researches, and we have to follow the method which is derived from them, irrespective of language. The result is that the arguments drawn from language are only secondary, whatever be their force. As regards the Old Testament, in most questions which do not turn on language, the Hebrew scholars are not the only authorities whose voice is decisive. We have to listen to the historians and in many cases to common sense.

I am far from questioning the great amount of learning which the Hebrew scholars have brought into the study of the Old Testament, and which has cleared many difficult points; but there is no special method for these old texts. Their authenticity, their composition, is ruled by the same laws as any other document of antiquity. Homer, the author of the two famous poems; Turold, the author of the *Chanson de Roland*; and others like Beowulf, have all been attacked by the same arguments as Moses. Their writings have been dismembered, cut to pieces, their literary activity has been denied, like that of Moses. But now they have been revived, they have been acknowledged as authors whose work is one, because scholars have recognised that too often philology had led them astray, and that they had to revert to sound

historical principles, which are independent of language.

It is not necessary to be familiar with the niceties of Hebrew grammar to see that the critics, in their reconstruction of Genesis, admit two authors who contradict each other in such a flagrant way that the second very nearly annihilates what the first has said. Nor is Hebrew scholarship needed to understand that the ceremonial law would certainly not have been admitted into their Pentateuch by the Samaritans, who did not adopt any of the Jewish books posterior to the Disruption of the kingdom, like the Prophets or the Psalter, if, as the critics maintain, this ceremonial law had been written and enacted, after the return from the Exile, by priests to whom they were violently hostile, and for a temple which they detested and the reconstruction of which they impeded as much as they could. These are two examples of questions of primary importance, absolutely unconnected with language.

I by no means underrate the value of the linguistic element, the more so since (if we have absolute proofs of what I maintain, that the Mosaic books were written in Babylonian cuneiform) it upsets the whole theory of the Critics as to the origin of those books, and it brushes off Elohist, Jahvist, and all the authors created by

the Critics in support of their theories. But it is only an additional argument. If we consider how the law was written, how the legislation given by Moses during the forty years in the desert is in perfect harmony with the peculiar circumstances of the time, with the only way he had to teach this law and to impress it on the minds of the people whose leader he was, the question of language does not arise. The form of the law would not be different if it were written in Accadian or Hebrew.

Therefore I believe that as regards the Old Testament the general principles of the historical method which rule the study of all ancient monuments, are more and more to be applied in opposition to those of Higher Criticism ; and it is what I endeavoured to do in this book.

ÉDOUARD NAVILLE.

GENEVA,
7th February 1923.

TRANSLATOR'S INTRODUCTION

A BRIEF, but profoundly appreciative, notice of M. Naville's *La Haute Critique dans le Pentateuque*, which appeared in the July 1922 number of *The Expository Times* over the name of the eminent Orientalist, A. H. Sayce, induced me to procure a copy of this Swiss-French work. Upon perusal, I was so favourably impressed with Dr. Naville's vindication of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, and generally felt myself so much in accord with the principles which underlie that vindication, that I ventured to put myself into communication with the distinguished author, and asked leave to have his *brochure* rendered into English. My request was, with the utmost cordiality, acceded to.

As far as persons taking an interest in Egyptian explorations are concerned, Dr. Édouard Naville's name has been well and favourably known, for a considerable number of years, throughout the Anglo-Saxon world. In connection with archæological work, carried on largely under the auspices of the Egypt Exploration Fund, he has won for

himself a name that ranks with those of Mariette, De Rougé, and Flinders Petrie. Switzerland, as his opponent in the present connection generously acknowledges, is proud of her most distinguished Egyptologist.

Dr. Naville is a lover of the Bible. He has not been indifferent to the modern assaults upon the authenticity of large portions of it, and he has weighed carefully the reasons alleged for questioning the genuineness of the Pentateuch in particular. But he was providentially placed, for probably a longer period than any living European scholar, just in the heart of the country where the events, in which Moses was the central figure, transpired, and he is naturally endowed with a power of intuition, into the significance and implications of what he sees and experiences, that is equalled by few, with the result that he continues firm in the conviction that only one knowing Egypt as Moses did, and standing in relation to Israel as Moses stood, could have written the Pentateuch.

This conviction has led Dr. Naville actively to take the field against what is regarded as the dominant school of Biblical critics. The principal works in which he before now gave expression to his point of view are, *The Archæology of the Old Testament*, published in 1913, and *The Schweich Lectures of 1915*, published in 1916. An important article entitled *La Loi de Moïse* appeared in the *Revue de Theologie et de Philosophie* in October

1920, which was afterwards printed separately, and was early in 1922 issued by the venerable Dean of Canterbury in English garb.

Dr. Naville's exposition of the principles that should rule our evaluation of ancient documents, and the application which he makes of these principles in confirming the traditional view of the authorship of the Pentateuch, is winning adherents on the Continent of Europe, and an evidence of that fact came to light with the publication in 1920 of Dean Doumergue's *Moïse et la Genèse*, in which that experienced historian undertakes to popularise the ideas of M. Naville on the origin of the Old Testament, and more especially of the Pentateuch.

M. Doumergue's *brochure* was the immediate occasion of a spirited reply, from the point of view of the Higher Critics, which appeared in the *Revue de Theologie et de Philosophie* (April 1921) over the name of Paul Humbert, Professor of Old Testament Exegesis in the University of Neuchâtel. To this article by Professor Humbert, M. Naville's *La Haute Critique*, of which the present work is a translation, is the reply.

M. Naville's present work is, however, more than a reply to M. P. Humbert's article. It is a reply, and that circumstance has inevitably had an influence to a certain extent in determining its form. But what is of more importance is the fact that in the present work, even more than in his earlier publications, M. Naville is primarily con-

cerned with the principles which ought to rule in our evaluation of all ancient documents whatsoever. He is keenly alive to the fact that the discussion that centres about the authorship of the Pentateuch is part of a larger whole; that, in fact, methods in criticism which result in denying Homer the credit of the *Iliad*; and Turold the *Song of Roland*; and Luke *The Acts of the Apostles*, are fundamentally one with the methods in criticism that result in a negation of the Mosiac authorship of the Pentateuch. And he rejoices in the fact that a protest, which is growing in weight and intensity, is, in the name of literature, truth, and religion, being lifted up throughout the civilised world against the indiscriminate use of the scalpel-knife, and calling for a saner, a more sympathetic, a more historically correct attitude towards the great literary monuments of antiquity.

In this protest M. Naville joins, and thus, in harmony with the new conception of the functions of criticism, his work takes the form of enunciating principles and of showing the application of these principles to the determination of the matter in hand.

Professor Humbert in his *Revue* article, repeatedly charges Dr. Naville with the fault of begging the question, of assuming the truth of what has to be proved. But that is an unfair criticism, and a form of criticism that betrays the fault of M. Humbert's own standpoint. In civilised countries an accused person is reckoned

by the judge innocent as long as guilt is not established. It was only the Inquisition that adopted the inhuman conception in jurisprudence according to which the judge from the start regards the accused person as guilty. Dr. Naville simply asks that the question of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch be treated according to the laws of civilised nations. It comes to us professing, expressly in four-fifths, and by implication in five-fifths of its contents, to be of Mosaic authorship. This claim of authorship is corroborated as correct by the continuous and consistent testimony of men who had the best means of knowing the truth all along the line of ancient Jewish history. It is a claim countenanced by the Son of God Himself, and after Him by the Apostles, who were His chosen instruments in founding the New Testament Church. The claim is made in a collection of books that have certainly been the supreme instrument in delivering the world from the inanities, and worse than inanities, of Polytheism and Atheism.

Can this claim be validated on principles that are applicable to all ancient documents with which tradition has associated a certain authorship? M. Naville answers in the affirmative. By three *stadia*, in each of which there is the assertion of principle, and a view given of the application of the principle to the matter in hand, M. Naville reaches a conclusion in the sense of the validation of the Pentateuch's own claim to Mosaic authorship.

I

First (pp. 12–87), M. Naville, in substance, asks whether the document in question, when taken at its face value, makes good sense, and is intrinsically perfectly consistent with itself. It was impossible, in such a compressed discussion as is given us here, to make an examination of the kind suggested to include, in a particular application of the principle, the whole Pentateuch. It therefore became necessary to make a selection, and the passage—Gen. i.–iv.—which the author selects for the purpose in hand, will be accepted by the Higher Critics themselves as a fair specimen. They will acknowledge that if the traditional view is right here, it is probably right all along the line.

M. Naville submits that when it is realised that these four chapters consist of two distinct tablets, the narrative contained in them will appear consistent in itself, and to be perfectly consistent with unity of authorship.

What is found, on a careful examination, to be true of the opening chapters of Genesis is, it is submitted, with such proofs as, under the limitation, is possible, true of the Pentateuch as a whole. That, constructively.

Destructively, what M. Naville, at this stage, does, is to hold up to the light that construction of the opening chapters of Genesis in particular,

and, cursorily, of the Pentateuch in general, by means of which the Higher Critics aim at displacing the traditional view. He holds it up, I say, to the light of a reason that is at once powerful, clear, and gracious, and in that light the " critical " construction appears preposterous.

There is nothing bitter in M. Naville's mode of procedure; he is too gracious and too full of humour to be dominated by what James castigates as " wisdom that descendeth not from above." At the same time his humour will on occasions pass over into a form of irony that for delicacy and for effectiveness reminds one of the genius of Pascal.

Professor Humbert (*Revue*, 1920, p. 79) slightly demurs to Dean Doumergue's description of Ex. vi. 3 as supplying " the grand critical objection " to the unity of the Pentateuch, but he will scarcely deny that the question raised through the interpretation which the Higher Critics put upon that verse is vital. If the Higher Critics are wrong there and the traditional interpretation right, *causa finita est.*

We confidently submit to impartial judgement that interpretation and vindication of the passage at issue that is set forth in pp. 59–87 of the present volume, and we shall have no dubiety as to the verdict.

II

The next question that, in a particular reference, comes up for discussion may be put in this form: Is the Pentateuch in harmony with what is now known of the external conditions—political, ethical, and cultural—that formed the environment of Moses? M. Naville answers this question in the affirmative, and the proof preferred is regarded as consisting of two parts.

The first part (pp. 88–102) is concerned with the language and script in which the Pentateuch has been transmitted to us; and while the leading statement in this first part must be regarded as vital to M. Naville's manner of conceiving the case, what goes beyond that leading statement, although that also is an extremely interesting discussion, is held by the author to be not vital to his argument, and is therefore of secondary importance.

It is an extraordinary circumstance that as late as 1892 a leading exponent of the Higher Criticism, H. Schultz, was capable of saying that "the time, of which the pre-Mosaic narratives treat, is a sufficient proof of their legendary character. It was a time prior to all knowledge of writing" (*O.T. Theology*, i. p. 25). The truth, as now known, is that, millenniums before Moses, a genuine and serviceable, although not an alphabetical, form of writing was in common use in the land of Abraham's nativity, and that almost a thousand years before

Abraham, Sargon, king of Babylon, who subdued all the peoples that lay between his capital and the Mediterranean, caused the Babylonian culture of the period, with the Babylonian language and the cuneiform script, to be spread out, over the conquered country, as a net. Remnants of that civilisation clung to Syria, inclusive of Palestine, for more than a thousand years after Abraham.

The term "Babylonian" sounds strange, but the truth is that, apart from the cuneiform in which it was always written, and which is really difficult, it is not as a language, say, to one that knows Hebrew tolerably well, really strange or difficult, and scholars are generally agreed that as between the Babylonian vernacular and the ancient Hebrew vernacular the difference was merely dialectical. On this account Abraham, whose mother tongue was Babylonian, would have little difficulty in making himself, from the first, easily understood in Canaan, where the vernacular was Hebrew. In course of time the vernacular of Abraham's descendants became Hebrew.

When Moses, then, wrote the Pentateuch the writing was not alphabetical, but, as the author maintains, of the cuneiform kind of script. And as cuneiform was always cut into wet clay or into some material that had the qualities of wet clay, the Pentateuch must be supposed to have been written upon clay tablets.

Moses could not be accurately described as "learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians"

without a knowledge of cuneiform Babylonian, for we know, from the Tel el-Amarna tablets, that in his time the kings of Egypt carried on their correspondence with all the Semitic peoples by means of that script and language. That Moses actually did make use of this script finds support in such considerations as that—(*a*) When the ten commandments were written with the finger of God, the writing was upon tables of stone; (*b*) when the law was written it was *laid up*, possibly in a jar (as clay tablets would be) by the side of the Ark; (*c*) when Joshua wrote the law upon stones at Mt. Ebal, these stones were, for that very end, plaistered with plaister.

So far, I should think, most Semitic scholars, who believe that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, will be in substantial agreement with M. Naville. It is conceivable that Moses, who, of course, knew Hebrew, wrote Hebrew in cuneiform, and some excellent Semitic scholars seem to cling to that view of things. But it must be owned that it is a view that has no direct evidence to support it. So far as evidence goes, we should have to conclude that in the time of Moses all, or virtually all, written Semitic—and Hebrew is Semitic—was written in Babylonian, and if in Babylonian, then in cuneiform.

The presence of a fair number of Hebrew or Phœnician terms in the cuneiform Babylonian Tel el-Amarna tablets no more disturbs the truth of that general statement, than the occasional use of a broad Scots term, in a thoroughly good

English letter, makes the letter itself broad Scots. These glosses (p. 146) show, of course, that it is conceivable that Hebrew should be written in cuneiform ; but they do not prove it to be likely. They show what was possible, but not what is probable.

What has been said will indicate, with sufficient clearness, the nature of the leading statement in the first part of the argument that is concerned with the external environments of Moses. The argument is developed, and that with great wealth of illustration, in the author's *Archæology*, and in his *Schweich Lectures*.

M. Naville lays emphasis upon this part of his argument for several reasons: It is of value to know the facts in the interests of scientific truth. The facts support his thesis that the writing of the Pentateuch by Moses is in harmony with the cultural condition of the wide world in the days of Moses. It disposes of many difficulties that occur in studying the text of the Old Testament.

Take, for an example of the kind of difficulties that are thus disposed of, an argument based upon the term " Dan " as the name of a town which was Abraham's *terminus ad quem* in his pursuit of Amraphel and others, according to Gen. xiv. 14. It has been confidently stated by the Higher Critics that " Dan " is here an anachronism, or rather that it plainly shows that the account was written posterior to the conquest of Canaan. But, on the likely supposition that an ideograph stood

in the autograph for "Dan," it was almost inevitable that when the cuneiform was changed into an alphabet, the place's name should be spelt according to the name it bore when the transcription was made. And, in fact, on the principle here enunciated very many of the instances of words which the Higher Critics, attending to the sound only and not to the sense, bring forward as characteristics of different authors, cease to have any value.

M. Naville's proposition, that the Pentateuch was first written in the mother tongue of Abraham and on tablets, is a reasonable one; and with that proposition fully established, all that is necessary, in order to show that the Pentateuch, in matter and form, is in harmony with all that is known of the world in the days of Moses, has been achieved.

But our author proceeds to ask, who it was that transformed the cuneiform Babylonian into an alphabetical kind of writing, and what script was made use of when this transformation took place; for, to use his own words, "this change of form and script cannot be called a real translation; it was only a dialectical modification." With his eye on learned Jewish tradition, and on comparatively recent discoveries in Egypt, and on what is commonly accepted as fact in respect of the evolution of the square Hebrew character, he answers that most probably the transformation was effected by Ezra, rendering, as he may be supposed to have done, into the Aramaic the

Babylonian language of Moses, and for that end making use of the Aramaic script of that age. Two or three notes may here be helpful.

(*a*) As to Jewish tradition, there is in the Talmud (Sanh. 21*b*) this oft-quoted passage: "Originally the law was given to Israel in the Hebrew character and in the sacred tongue; *it was given again to them in the days of Ezra in the Assyrian character and in the Aramaic tongue*: Israel chose for themselves the Assyrian character and the sacred tongue" (Italics mine).

(*b*) As to discoveries in Egypt, the Elephantine Papyri (see p. 144) and other forms of evidence, to which one need not now more particularly refer, have put it beyond question that *after the Exile* "all the Jews from Elephantine in Egypt, on the West, to Babylon, on the East, were speaking and writing Aramaic."

(*c*) As to the emergence of that square Hebrew character, with which readers of the Hebrew Bible are familiar, evidence of its existence is not forthcoming for an earlier date than the beginning of the second century B.C. It derives immediately from the Aramaic script.

With all these facts, and others also, which are alluded to in p. 101 f. of the present volume, and which are still more fully discussed in the *Schweich Lectures, 1915*, the author answers the questions that arise in connection with the transformation of the Pentateuch from cuneiform to an alphabetical script in the manner indicated on the previous page.

It will be observed that M. Naville, approaching the subject as an archæologist, is at one with Jewish tradition in regard to the language in which the Pentateuch appeared in the days of Ezra.

If that tradition is correct—and here we are not allowed to speak with much dogmatism—it follows that a further transformation into Hebrew or Jehudith took place at a still later date, and it is quite possible that this second dialectical transformation of the law waited the development of the square Hebrew script.

The specific Hebrew script does not seem to have been in use earlier than 200 B.C., and M. Naville, from the close relationship which he conceives to exist between the literary dialect and the script, concludes that it was only with the emergence of the Hebrew script that any part of the Old Testament was written in what we now call Hebrew ; that earlier than 200 B.C. it was all written either in cuneiform Babylonian or in the Aramaic language. M. Naville's reasons for making the literary dialect—not the spoken—emerge in time along with a special script, are of an historical and analogical character, and have in view, especially, what is known of the ancient dialects of Egypt, which were spoken dialects for ages ere they became literary dialects, and, in fact, became, in every case (see p. 91), literary dialects only with the emergence of specific scripts. This point of view is best set forth in

the author's *L'Évolution de la Langue Égyptienne*, p. 152 f.

With profound respect, I would venture to say that, in a case like Hebrew or Jehudith, which might very easily be written with either the Canaanite script or the Aramaic script, it might be hazardous to press the connection between the literary dialect and the specific script too closely. One is more inclined to say this, because the reasons that dispose one to conclude that the Prophets, Isaiah for instance, wrote in the Jehudith of his own period, are cogent.

Hesitation, however, regarding a particular extension of the author's argument—and, in fact, M. Naville himself, in this reference, adopts the method of submitting an opinion, with reasons, for the judgement of the learned, rather than the method of dogmatic statement—does not weaken one's confidence in the author's leading argument under this head, to wit, that the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch is, in the matter of writing, in entire harmony with the cultural conditions of the period in which Moses lived; and that the dialectical transformation, which the presupposition of a cuneiform Pentateuch makes necessary, renders the "critical" philological argument, which is concerned with words rather than with the meaning of words, futile.

It is a curious thing that, probably, in every passage in which the Bible speaks of the Hebrew tongue, it means Aramaic, and that when it speaks

of what we commonly call Hebrew, it uses the term Jehudith (John v. 2, xix. 13, 17, 20, xx. 16; Acts xxi. 40, xxii. 2, xxvi. 14; Rev. ix 11, xvi. 16; 2 Kings xviii. 26, 28; Isa. xxxvi. 11, 13; 2 Chron. xxxii. 18; Neh. xiii. 24). So much for the language and script.

But let us now come to the second part of the proof submitted in support of the thesis that not in what concerns language and writing alone is the Pentateuch, on the supposition of its Mosaic authorship, in harmony with the contemporary environment, but that it may be demonstrated to be so with the widest reference possible.

This part of the discussion (pp. 119–131) is comparatively brief, for the reason that M. Naville's statements in this reference are not seriously challenged, and that they may be found fully stated in his other works. In his *Archæology* especially, but not exclusively, the author has drawn, in no niggardly fashion, upon his almost unrivalled knowledge of conditions in Egypt in ancient times in order to establish the thesis that between the Pentateuch and the contemporary external environment there is a harmony that is not a mere occasional coincidence but of a kind so sustained as to compel the conclusion that only one who knew Egypt as Moses is traditionally held to have known it, could have written the Pentateuch. All that is attempted here is to give a specimen or two from which readers can easily gather what is the nature of that material out of which the part

now before us of the author's argument, as seen more fully stated in the author's other works, is constructed.

Thus, (*a*) the description of Joseph's wife, Asenath, as "the daughter of Potipherah, priest of On" (Gen. xli. 45), apart from the special inspiration of Moses, gains in verisimilitude when the description is found to tally so strikingly with what we now know of On in the period of Joseph, as "exercising a predominant power in everything relating to religion" (Naville's *The Old Egyptian Faith*, p. 115). And the fact, that on all the three occasions on which Joseph's wife is mentioned (*add* xli. 50, xlvi. 20) she is formally introduced, in genuinely honorific terms, as "Asenath, the daughter of Potipherah, priest of On," lends support to the idea that it was Joseph himself, after the example of the great men of Egypt of his period, who saw to the recording of his own experiences, and that that record, as M. Naville suggests, was Moses' source in writing what concerns Joseph in the Pentateuch.

(*b*) Appeal is made to the striking correctness of the Pentateuch, and, as it happens, of the Books of Kings also, in what concerns regional botany. This is shown by a reference to the description given of the material used in the construction of the Tabernacle and of the Temple respectively; cedar wood being, according to the Biblical narrative, used for the latter building, and acacia or shittim wood for the former:

"Cedar [which is so much in place for Solomon's time] does not appear in the construction of the Ark and the Tabernacle. They are to be made of acacia wood. This tree is found in Egypt, and the Egyptians made great use of it. They used it for making furniture and boats. It was the favourite wood for the doors of the temples. . . . Outside of Egypt, it is found in the Sinaitic peninsula and near the Dead Sea, but not farther north. Acacia is a tree of the Sinaitic desert. But it is not a Palestinian tree. Except for a few bushes, no *acacia tree* is found in Palestine. . . . Here the narrator is entirely in accordance with the local conditions, with the nature of the desert, and what could be found there. Can we suppose that the post-exilian writer is so true to his historical standpoint, that he can describe a kind of construction which had been out of use for centuries both in Palestine and in Mesopotamia? Does it not seem more likely that the narrator had been in the desert himself, and pictured what he had seen?"

But, in view of all that has been brought to light at Luxor, even in the brief period that has transpired since M. Naville wrote his *La Haute Critique*, how can one help asking, What need is there for an expert to take us by the hand? Tutankhamen's tomb will compel students of the Old Testament to study the Pentateuch with a background presupposed which differs as much from that imagined by the earlier Higher Critics

as light differs from darkness. It will no longer seem unlikely that the skill which Bezaleel manifested in devising cunning works, to work in gold and in silver and in brass, and in cutting stones to set them, and in carving of timber, to work in all manner of workmanship, should have had the Egypt of Tutankhamen as its provenance. Why, when *inter multa* one reads, in a contemporary newspaper, in a description of precious things taken out of Tutankhamen's tomb, a sentence like this: "On the fourth stretcher was also a piece of extraordinary fine linen, very strongly woven, with red and blue stripes," one could almost imagine that it was a passage from Exodus, with its "fine twined linen, and blue and purple and scarlet," that one had chanced upon.

III

I have thus indicated in outline, with, I hope, some elucidations, how Dr. Naville establishes his second thesis, in the sense that on the supposition that the Pentateuch was written by Moses, it is found to ring true to all that is now known of the conditions, political and cultural, of Egypt in the days of Moses. It remains, in order to conclude the argument, to ask whether, as the doctrine of the Mosaic authorship implies, the Pentateuch may reasonably be regarded as the

natural expression of one powerful mind, and of one great leader, whose one aim in life was to prepare Israel to enter upon possession of the promised land, so as to live there as the people of Jehovah. This M. Naville has little difficulty in demonstrating (see pp. 132–140). The improbable account of the matter given by the Higher Critics serves, in this case, as a foil which shows off the true view to great advantage.

M. Naville is disposed to make the school of critics whom he opposes a present of the term "Higher Criticism." That does not mean that he denies the legitimacy or undervalues the gain to the interpreter of knowing all that is possible to know about the authorship, origin, and historical trustworthiness of any document whatsoever that is a subject of study. The reason of the suggestion is, that it is now demonstrable that the background, against which those scholars who have flouted the voice of tradition have put their own conception of the authorship and historical trust-worthiness of many of the greatest literary and religious monuments of the past, was absolutely unhistorical and untrue to the actual facts.

It is demonstrable that in almost every field in which the Higher Critics have, in respect of the great literary monuments of antiquity, called in question the traditional view of authorship, they have shown themselves to be remarkably

lacking in that kind of intuition that would enable them to grasp correctly the historical background of the writings with which they have dealt. The truth of this might be shown in connection with Wolf's ideas of the *Iliad*, as compared with all that recent excavations have brought to light in Troy, Mycenæ, and Crete. An instance has already been submitted arising out of the ideas which the earlier critics cherished as to knowledge of a script in the days of Moses. Take one other single example from the New Testament.

In the matter of the date of the Gospel according to John, the Higher Critics, some eighty years ago, put its date down at *c.* A.D. 165. That view was contended for during several decades. But in 1876, Ephraim the Syrian's commentary on the long-lost *Diatessaron* of Tatian was discovered, and, better still, in 1888, an Arabic version of the *Diatessaron* itself came to light. The *Diatessaron* could scarcely have been much later than A.D. 150, and the *Diatessaron* used the Gospel according to John as one of its fundamental documents. The Higher Critics were compelled to make the Gospel according to John earlier than A.D. 150. They still felt themselves safe in dating it *c.* A.D. 130. Then, unfortunately for them, a fragment of the pseudepigraphic "Gospel of Peter" turned up at Akhmin in Egypt. Professor Turner of Oxford showed conclusively that just our four Gospels were the material out of which the author of "the Gospel of Peter" weaved his own form of the Gospel

of Jesus Christ. But the references to this pseudepigraphic work, that occur in other authorities, are so early, that the work itself can be scarcely later than A.D. 120. The end of the process has been that the Higher Critics have been forced to accept the traditional view of the date of the Gospel according to John, and Professor F. C. Burney in his *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel*, actually suggests, in the year of grace 1922, the year A.D. 75 as the date of John!

It will, I should think, be a cause of unfeigned joy to those scholars who, in Great Britain and America, have long withstood the methods of the Higher Critics, to recognise comrades in arms in the French-speaking world. It is not the first time that Geneva and Protestant France came to the help of the Lord against the mighty.

We are truly grateful to Sir William M. Ramsay for his helpful and courageous Foreword. No living scholar has been equally successful with him in bringing fellow-scholars to look with favour upon the traditional view of the authorship of our third Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles, and that gain has had a good effect on what relates to New Testament Introduction generally. It is an omen of what the scholarly world will soon homologate, that a man of his culture and great experience should agree with M. Naville on the subject of the authorship of the Pentateuch.

I wish also to express my cordial thanks to my

learned friend and colleague, the Rev. Professor Robert Moore, B.D., who both read my translation in type-written form, comparing it with the original text, and also assisted me in correcting the proofs; and who, besides, offered several valuable suggestions that proved very helpful to me.

I have added a considerable number of Notes, which, however, are intended, at least in the main, for readers to whom Reference Libraries are not accessible. They are thus largely of the nature of a miniature Who's Who.

JOHN R. MACKAY.

FREE CHURCH COLLEGE,
EDINBURGH.

CONTENTS

		PAGE
	FOREWORD	v
	AUTHOR'S PREFACE	vii
	AUTHOR'S PREFACE TO THE TRANSLATION	ix
	TRANSLATOR'S INTRODUCTION	xiii
CHAPTER I.	THE HIGHER CRITICISM: ITS NAME, ITS PRETENSIONS	1
II.	THE TWO METHODS	12
III.	THE LANGUAGE OF MOSES: ARAMAIC: HEBREW	88
IV.	THE PENTATEUCH OF THE CRITICS	132
	NOTES BY THE TRANSLATOR	141
	INDEXES	151

THE HIGHER CRITICISM
IN RELATION TO
THE PENTATEUCH

CHAPTER I

THE HIGHER CRITICISM

Its Name

HIGHER CRITICISM, which we (French-speaking people) render *Haute Critique*, is, as a term, an invention of the Anglo-Saxons. The term is not yet in common use in the French language. Thus, M. Camille Jullian (*a*),* in this reference, says : " The method which is designated by it has been called by different names. Its admirers often call it *The Higher Criticism*, or even *The Hyper-Criticism*, while other historians have thought it were more correctly described as *the method of the Destructive School* ; and, in fact, the exponents of the method in question have not disavowed this last expression."

* Figures refer to Author's footnotes ; letters, to Translator's Notes at the end, p. 141.

At the same time, it seems to me that there would be an advantage in our generally adopting this term, *Higher Criticism*, for it clearly designates a quite definite method—as described, say, by one of its most ardent and convinced masters, Dr. Briggs, an American critic (*b*).

Its Nature

The Higher Criticism, according to him, is based on what is denominated "The Lower Criticism," that is to say, on the criticism of the text, or the fixing of the text in accordance with the manuscripts and the monumental sources.[1]

Starting from that base, the investigations of the Higher Criticism are directed to the settling of four points:

1. The Integrity of the Book.

Is the book in question the product of a single mind? Is it composed of several pieces of the same author? Or is it a collection of writings by different authors? "The Pentateuch," says Dr. Briggs, "is ascribed by the prevalent tradition to Moses. . . . This tradition has no sound historical basis. . . . The book is made up of several different codes, and is the handiwork of a number of editors at different epochs in the history of Israel." Thus, so far as the Pentateuch is concerned, the whole is but tradition.

[1] *The Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch*, p. 1.

Of course, it is written, possibly a hundred times, in the last four books of the Pentateuch, that these are the words or the writings of Moses. But that makes no difference. There is no reason why we should trouble ourselves with the circumstance that so "it is written." It is mere tradition and, as such, ought to vanish out of sight.

That is the first blow struck at tradition.

2. Its Authenticity.

"Is the name of the author given in connection with the writing? Is the writing anonymous, or pseudonymous, or is it a compilation?" The Higher Criticism gives us to understand that the Hexateuch is anonymous, and that it is a compilation. Thus, Deuteronomy is anonymous. The fact that so many discourses are therein said to have been due to Moses or to have been spoken by him, does not save it from being an anonymous writing.

That is the second blow struck at tradition.

3. Its Literary Form.

"Is the writing prose or poetry?" If it is prose, what is the character of the prose? If it is poetry, what is the nature of the poetry? The Higher Criticism finds in the Hexateuch four historical narratives, which differ in style and in method, together with some ancient poems which were incorporated with the narrative, of which one might make a collection almost as important as

the Psalter—all that, besides several codes of laws which differ absolutely in the method of their codification and in their contents.

That is the third blow struck at tradition.

4. Its Credibility.

Is what we read in these writings reliable? The Higher Criticism sets to establishing the credibility of the Hexateuch by completely overthrowing the arrangement which, what they call tradition, puts us in possession of, and under tradition we are to include not alone that kind of remembrance of past events which orally transmits itself from one generation to another, but also written accounts which happen to be not in keeping with the conceptions of the Higher Criticism.

That is the final destruction of tradition.

It will be admitted, after one has heard Dr. Briggs give that interpretation of the nature and function of the Higher Criticism, that the name *The Destructive School*, which by some authorities has been given to the Higher Criticism, is an absolutely correct one. Its essential aim is destruction, and on this account no investigation that should aim at confirming the truth of tradition would be worthy the name of the Higher Criticism. Destruction is the only aspect of their work concerning which the Critics are in agreement. They claim, no doubt, to have done some-

thing by way of reconstruction too, but in that regard they are far from being of one accord; their judgements are in this respect very divergent. And that circumstance can be easily understood. In a matter of criticism, it is an easy thing to say that a book is not the work of the author to whom it has been ascribed. That habit has become a kind of philological game, practised largely in certain universities. At the same time, it is none the less true that even if it were conceded that a particular book had not been written by the author whose name it bears, the Critic is only half-way with his undertaking, and the half overtaken is by far the easier half. What is distinctly difficult is to show reason why the writing in question has been attributed to a particular author, or at what time and through whose influence this attribution took place. I have no hesitation in saying that, on those important points, you often find the Critic giving as an established fact what is merely his own opinion, in many cases a mere hypothesis.

The Pretensions of the Higher Criticism

It is in the sphere of reconstruction that the Higher Criticism is especially weak, and that because it sets out with a method which, in unison with some eminent contemporary scholars, whose numbers are daily on the increase, I declare to be unsound. I do not conceal from myself that, in saying so, I utter what in the estimation of most

of the devotees of the Higher Criticism is regarded as almost blasphemy. For, in setting forth the conclusions at which it arrives, the Higher Criticism proclaims from the outset, and never tires of repeating, that these are conclusions that cannot be called in question, that they alone are the expression of the truth, and that in this field there is no other method save its own. This belief has become one of its primary foundations, and Criticism has so assimilated this idea that, in turn, the idea influences its manner of judging any opinion that may be contrary to itself. "We alone are in possession of the truth"—there you have the starting-point of all those who belong to this school. Listen, if you please, to one of its most eminent members, to one whom I have already cited—Dr. Briggs:

"The Higher Criticism has vindicated its rights in the field of biblical study as well as in all other kinds of literature. It matters little who may oppose its course, what combinations may be made against it, it will advance steadily and irresistibly to its results; it will flow on over every obstacle like a mighty river and bury every obstruction beneath its waves. In time it will give a final decision to all literary problems of Holy Scripture. No other voice can decide them. Men may for a time refuse to listen to its voice; they may try to deaden it by a chorus of outcries and shoutings of opposition. But Higher Criticism is in no haste, she can wait. She does not seek the favour

of ecclesiastics, nor the applause of the populace. She seeks the truth, and having won the truth, she is sure of the everlasting future. . . .

"It is quite true that some able and honest men are opposed to the principles and methods of the Higher Criticism. But everyone of these is opposed to criticism on dogmatic grounds, because it imperils the dogmas of his school and party. The same set of men have opposed every advance of modern science and modern philosophy. Such men are not true biblical scholars. What kind of a detective would he make, who should maintain that there was no sure way of detecting criminals? What sort of a chemist would he make, who spent his strength in opposing and ridiculing the principles and results of chemistry? One sees what sort of scholars these are, who exhaust their energies in discrediting the principles of the Higher Criticism, and in battling against its sure results." [1]

It would be impossible to set forth more clearly the dogma of the infallibility of the Higher Criticism, a dogma which the Higher Critics no more call in question than a Catholic priest does the infallibility of the Pope. There is truth only in the results at which it arrives. Hence it is that in the case of a great number of the Higher Critics, the favourite argument is contempt. The adversaries are only bigots who reject the laws of Galileo. A few years hence, and they will have disappeared as completely as slave dealers. To

[1] Briggs, *The Study of the Holy Scripture*, p. 108.

uphold the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch is "unscholarly"; it is indeed an "absurdity." There is only one method, that of the Higher Criticism; every other method is wrong. To assert opinions contrary to those of the Higher Critics, as I have ventured to do, is an instance of presumptuousness on the part of an incompetent scholar. They will not condone the fault of even a French historian who by his splendid studies has won for himself distinction, and unquestionable authority — I refer to M. E. Doumergue (*c*) [1]—because, in a volume relating to my works, he popularises opinions that are so improbable, and so monstrous, as mine, and corroborates assertions that are said to be void of any solid basis :—which, however, will happily not endure long. (Ch. Bruston.) (*c*[1])

A Better Method

It goes without saying that I am far from being deterred by such contemptuous utterances, or from being brought to a state of repentance. On the contrary, that sort of language can only harden me to redouble my efforts in a contest in which, along with others, I take part against the Higher Criticism. With that end in view, I shall principally attack it on a point of capital importance, one which our

[1] Doumergue, *Moise et la Genèse d'apres les travaux de M. le Professeur Eduoard Naville.* Paris Edition de Foi at Vie, 1920.

adversaries, generally speaking, left aside—I mean, on the question of method. In acting thus, I shall have the feeling that I am placing the contest on its true footing. I shall make an effort to develop what I call our method, for I am far from being the only advocate of this method. In fact, that "contemptible minority," of whom the Critics speak so disparagingly, have already become quite a respectable company, if not in numbers, at least in virtue of the authority which belongs to those who compose it. I am possibly the first, I mean in the French language, who has applied this method to the writings of the Old Testament, but beyond the French-speaking world I find —to cite only the most recent works—that the two volumes of the American professor, Dr. Kyle (*d*), dealing with Moses and the Pentateuch, come to conclusions that are identical with mine. But in other departments of literature, the contest against the "chorizontes" (*e*), against the dissection of the texts, against "German historiography which exists only to destroy, to contradict and to deny, by force of special pleadings, all that the ancients had affirmed and related"—that contest, I say, has now been entered upon, and is daily becoming more intense.

Thus, M. Camille Jullian has established unity of authorship in respect of the *Song of Roland*. M. Bedier enables us to identify the true authors of our heroic poems; M. Victor Bérard does a similar service in regard to Homer; M. Lot in

what concerns Lancelot of the Lake ; other French scholars or jurists (*f*), relatively to questions of ancient finance, or to the Laws of the Twelve Tables; all these, I say, have shown us the mistakes which those coryphæi of erudition—the Wolfs, the Grimm Brothers, the Niebuhrs, the Mommsens (*g*)—have committed, men who through hypercritical pride were not afraid to treat as a negligible quantity the witness of the ancients to their own historians. It will be said that these are matters which differ entirely from the questions agitated in respect of the Old Testament, but the truth is, the method is uniform for each and every school of criticism, be the subject with which the school occupies itself what it may. And just so Dr. Briggs, for his part, tells us that the Higher Criticism is established as victor in the department of Biblical studies, as in that of other kinds of ancient literature. And we too when we come to deal with ancient documents have only one method, and it is that one method which I now wish to explain as I place it over against that of the Higher Criticism. At the same time that I am developing the general nature of our method, I shall point out the conclusion which, in a particular reference, flows from it—the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. Although I am told that my work is unscholarly, I shall nevertheless take in hand to develop arguments which tell in favour of an " absurdity " ; one which I shall continue to uphold, " to the great astonish-

ment of most, not to say, of all competent persons " (Ch. Bruston).

I address myself, then, to readers of the Bible whose minds are not closed, who are guided by intelligence and good sense, and I hope to show them that " a blind begging of the question," which, according to M. Humbert, is the characteristic of my works, is not really found on my side at all, but is rather to be ascribed to such as will not by any means have it that the Pentateuch is from the hands of Moses, and who are necessitated to manipulate the text in order to bring it into harmony with their preconceived ideas.

CHAPTER II

THE TWO METHODS

The Historical Method

Its First Principle.

THE fundamental principle upon which our method rests is that which Fustel de Coulanges (*h*) formulates: "Let us," says he, "put to one side the absolute logic and intellectual conceptions of the present, and take the ancient texts in their proper and literal sense exactly as they were written. Let us interpret them in the simplest manner possible, and with unsophisticated minds allow them to speak for themselves, mixing nothing of our own with them." In other words, we must begin by way of giving the texts a fair hearing, taking to heart what they tell us, even when possibly they may not be conformed to our modern ideas, or when they may impinge upon those rules of logic which the scholars of our time think should be made binding upon them.

This principle we are now to apply to the texts with which the Old Testament opens, the first chapters of Genesis.

The first chapter, like the whole Book of Genesis, is anonymous. Differently from that which we

find written in the four following books, it is not said in Genesis that Moses was the author thereof. We learn that he was so by tradition. Has that tradition taught us the exact truth? Was it indeed Moses who wrote the book? We shall later on set forth the reasons upon which we ground our conviction that Moses verily was the author of Genesis, and that none other than he could have written it. For the moment, however, we are simply engaged in ascertaining what it is that the text on the face of it tells us.

It teaches us, then, at the outset that Elohim—a term which we render God, and which answers to what we understand by God—created the earth and the heavens in six days. The work of each of these days is briefly described. The culminating work is the creation of man, the king of living beings, who was made in the image of God, to whom dominion, over everything that lives, was due. But in this first narrative man is regarded as only part of the mass or greater whole. The narrative by no means brings as yet to light that a special place was assigned to man as over against God, or that there were special communications being carried on between the Deity and His creature, man. Thus, when God caused the great fishes—beings that live in the waters—and the birds of the air to appear, He blessed them and said: "Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the waters in the seas, and let birds multiply upon the earth." And so again, when God created man

in His own image, "He blessed them and said to them: 'Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth.'" He added: that He had given them every herb and every kind of fruit for their nourishment; just as He had done in regard to the lower animals. Why is it that it is only of mankind it is said that they were created male and female, although, of course, that condition of their filling the earth held good of the lower animals too? The reason is that, in the instance of the creation of mankind, there was something singular in the manner of the creation of Adam's companion, and the intention is that that something will be related more fully later on when the author shall have occasion to deal with what in a more exclusive sense concerns mankind. For the moment, man is simply a living creature, the crowning product of the great mass; but the moral element is not as yet brought out. He belongs to the earth, like the lower animals, and in a résumé of the work of Elohim, the Creator God—"These are the beginnings of the heavens and of the earth when they were created" (Gen. ii. 4)—man, as an item, is not singled out from among all the living creatures. This résumé some wrongly take to be the title of the next chapter (*i*).

Yet the crown of creation is man, and in what follows the author is occupied with what concerns man: his creation is rehearsed with details; then that of his companion; a description is given of

their first abode, and of those intercommunings of his with God which began with the Fall. In order to make the situation intelligible, man must be shown in exact relation with his surroundings, his place in the order of creation must be briefly indicated, and all the more so as what is now before us is a second tablet (*j*) which was not bound to the preceding tablet as closely as ordinarily a chapter in the modern sense of a book is with what goes before. It thus became necessary that, starting from creation, the author should develop more fully what, in a more summary manner, had been told us before. According to the translation of Olivétan, followed by Osterwald (*k*), we are told "that Jehovah God *had* formed man of the dust of the ground, that He *had* placed him in the garden of Eden, but He *had* (*l*) said: 'It is not good that the man should be alone'" (Gen ii. 9, 18). The lower animals, which had been created before Adam, had passed before him, he saw them all and named them all; but in all that stream of living creatures, among which, of course, anthropoid apes and pithecanthropi, the figures of which some nowadays love to portray for us, must have been manifest, a companion for man was not found, and so God adopted other means to provide him a suitable companion—all which we find related in full as we proceed to read our document. Henceforth, as the document shows, the facts follow in the historical order with the greatest possible simplicity; nor is there any reason to

imagine that this second tablet is due to another author than that of the tablet going before, which, as we saw, is concerned with the creation of the heaven and of the earth, or that it does not belong to the same period.

This second tablet, at the same time, emphasises a fundamental truth, a truth that lies at the basis of the religion and history of the Israelites, in the sense that God may be spoken of by two different names: Elohim, which answers to our term God, that is to say, the Creator, the Divine Being, regarded from the most general and universal point of view; and next, Jahveh,[1] who is God, considered under the more special aspect of His relation to and communications with mankind. Jahveh is the God of man, it is He Who enters into covenant with man, Who shows man both His power and His mercy. But Jahveh is exactly the same being as Elohim, the Creator. It is an important matter that that identification should be solemnly made from the creation of man, and on that account Moses, in this (second) tablet, in which it is a question for the time being of the creation of man, and of man's communications with God, gives God His two names, Jahveh Elohim. For the future, he can use the one term

[1] I repeat here what I have said elsewhere, that I am compelled by common usage to use this form, although I consider it an incorrect form, as, in fact, Mr. Cowley (l^1) has demonstrated. The Jews of the Elephantine called their God Jaho or Jahou, and that is the form which the word assumes in composition.

or the other, but when he treats of direct communications between man and God, he chooses Jahveh by preference; with the final result that Jahveh becomes the national God of the Israelites. At the same time, it should be borne in mind that the use of these names is by no means ruled by an inflexible law from which it is not permissible to vary—a kind of law of which German scholars are so very fond, and of which they are so prodigal in their works. Speak to us, therefore, no more of such a theology of Moses as would unalterably bind him in his use of these names, or put him under limitations upon which he is forbidden to infringe. Moses teaches us that God has always had two names, and by his books we see that the meaning of the two names is not in every respect the same, that when a Hebrew means to speak of *his* God or to *his* God, he by preference calls Him Jahveh—Jahveh is the proper name of *his* God, of his Elohim—as, for example, in his prayers.

We are told that it was in the time of Enosh, the grandson of Adam, that men began to invoke the name of Jahveh. And so Isaac, when he came to Beersheba, built there an altar, and called on the name of Jahveh. Similarly, Jacob, at the time of his distress, on account of the approach towards him of Esau, prays thus: "O God of my father Abraham, God of my father Isaac, Jahveh, which saidst unto me, Return unto thy country . . . deliver me." Abraham, whom Jahveh had commanded to leave his father's house, and to whom He

had made the most illustrious promises, approaches Jahveh, the God who held the supreme place in his life thus: "Lord Jahveh, what wilt Thou give me? Lord Jahveh, how shall I know that I shall possess this land?" This he says on the spot where the covenant between Jahveh and Abraham was concluded, after that the patriarch had heard those words: "I am Jahveh who brought thee forth out of Ur of the Chaldees." Elsewhere, the two names of God appear in one and the same chapter; Jahveh appears unto Abraham and says to him: "I am thy God (thine Elohim) and of thy seed after thee." It is Jahveh who promises a son to Sarah (Gen. xviii. 10). It is Jahveh that visits Sarah, and Jahveh does to Sarah as He had spoken to her. Sarah conceives and bears a son to Abraham, in his old age, at the time that God (Elohim) had appointed her. And Sarah says: "God (Elohim) hath made me to laugh." In the same manner we read of Rachel: "She bare a son and said, God (Elohim) hath taken away my reproach: and she called his name Joseph, and said: Jahveh shall add to me another son."

Later on, in the Song of Moses, after the passage through the Red Sea, we read: "I will sing unto Jahveh. . . . Jahveh is my strength and song, He is my God, I will glorify Him; He is the God of my father . . ."

One sees quite clearly, from all these passages, that the two names may in most cases be employed indifferently, and that, although they are

not used in exactly the same sense, the use is determined by the writer's feeling or inspiration at the moment, and not at all by an absolute rule which prescribes to the writer the cases when he must write Jahveh and the cases in which he is prohibited from using any other name than Elohim. We have not in French words which correspond exactly to these two names. We have something analogous to them in the terms *Dieu* and *le Seigneur* (God and Lord), and we are not too careful as to whether we use the one or the other. A missionary[1] informs us that the Malagasians, a people who are yet in many respects in a primitive state of culture, have also two names for God, names which in their use very much resemble that which the terms Jahveh and Elohim served for the children of Israel, and of which one, just like Jahveh, stands for God conceived of as He is related to mankind.

Let us then take the text as we find it, not going beyond what it exactly says: let us rather give heed to what it points out to us, and reckon with that which it teaches us. Now, what we learn from the text before us is that, from the appearance of man upon the earth, and from the time that God entered into direct communications with him, God has had a double name, Jahveh Elohim, and, later on, we find these two names used almost indifferently; but, naturally, Jahveh, because He had said so often that He is the God of the

[1] Parrot, *Defense de la Bible*, ii. p. 74.

Israelites, became Israel's national God. I see no reason why I should not receive as truth that exactly which the text thus sets forth, or why I should not take the words in their proper and literal sense, just as Fustel de Coulanges has taught us. And I am more than surprised at hearing M. Humbert tell me that in abiding by the words of the text, and in supposing that Moses has observed a use of terms that is so simple and so lucid, I " make him a metaphysician such as the age in which he lived knew not of."

The Method of the Higher Critics

That, then, illustrates the first principle of our method; for, in spite of the denials of the Critics, it is, in the proper sense, a method—very different, it is true, from theirs—but a method to which no one can refuse the name. We are now going to see what, in respect of these same two chapters of Genesis, is their method. We shall see that their method is based on a mode of procedure that is absolutely different from that of one who should feel himself bound to frankly lay out the ancient document before him, and understand it in its natural sense.

History of the Method of the Higher Critics

But let us go back to the origin of this critical method. On this point, France and Germany are of one mind. This form of criticism came to its

birth with the book of a French doctor, Astruc (*m*), who published at Brussels in 1753 a small volume entitled, *Conjectures as to the original Memoirs of which Moses seems to have made use in composing the Book of Genesis.*[1] He took as the principle of his analysis the two names of God, Elohim and Jehovah (which we read as Jahveh). "I maintain," says he, "that Moses had in his hands ancient memoirs containing the history of his ancestors from the beginning of the world; that, in order to lose no part of these memoirs he had them arranged into several pieces, following the order of the events that were recorded in them; that he placed these pieces as wholes one after another, and that it was from this collection that the Book of Genesis was formed." In this analysis, however, he goes slightly beyond Genesis, adding thereto the first two chapters of Exodus. He breaks up Genesis into its parts, and discovers therein, to begin with, two fundamental documents which differ in the name which they respectively give to God—one document, which he designates A, using Elohim, and the other, which he designates B, using Jehovah. We should, he says, perhaps recognise in Genesis several other less important primary sources, bringing the number of distinct sources up to something like a dozen, but the dozen or thereabout were ultimately reduced to four, and of these four, the principal

[1] *Conjectures sur les memoires originaux dont il parâit que Moise s'est servi pour composer le livre de la Genèse.*

ones, as we have seen, are A and B, documents distinguished according to the different names given in them to God.

That, then, indicates the nature of what has been called the " discovery " of Astruc, which for French-speaking theologians is the beginning of the criticism of the Old Testament. Some there be who never tire of extolling Astruc's achievement as a stroke of genius. But over against this discovery should be placed the circumstance, albeit it is one that those great admirers of Astruc pass by in silence, that no one maintained with more energy than did he, that Moses was the author not only of Genesis, but of the whole Pentateuch. On that idea of authorship does the whole system of Astruc rest. Moses, according to Astruc, had as authorities for events anterior to his birth documents from which he copied the several pieces as he found them, and of these he formed Genesis. As to those matters of which Moses was himself a witness, it is he himself that relates it, it is his own work; but as to what one reads in Genesis, Moses merely reproduced fragments that had been written by others who had lived before him. Astruc does not spare those who would throw doubt on the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. Only Moses could have written it, and such as are minded to call that fact into question are " but minds that have a show of strength, that give themselves triumphant airs, whose empty triumphs are but poorly grounded."

For German science, the father of criticism is Eichhorn (*n*), who wrote thirty years later than Astruc. Although he speaks in a tone of contempt of his French predecessor, he followed the same principle, and decomposed Genesis into documents, and of these the chief ones are the Elohist and the Jahvist. He occasionally differs from Astruc, to the extent of, at times, assigning a section to the Elohist which Astruc would assign to the Jahvist, and *vice versa*; but the division into two main documents, according to the name given in the several sections to God, is the corner-stone of the system of the later as of the earlier critic. They both maintain, with equal firmness, that those documents were earlier than Moses, and that Moses alone, by picking out the fragments that are found in both documents and welding them into one, could have been the author of Genesis. To think of attributing a part of his writings to Ezra, Eichhorn tells us, is but to mock human intelligence.

We see, therefore, that these fathers of criticism, before whom later Critics prostrate themselves, condemn, in the most formal manner, the theories of their intellectual descendants.

It is certain that in those ideas of Astruc and of Eichhorn there is some truth, but only an elementary truth, which simply shows ordinary good sense Moses did have sources of which he made use in writing Genesis. But what historian is there, when about to relate events anterior, possibly

by centuries, to his own time, but finds it necessary to resort to documents that are more ancient than himself? It could not have been otherwise with Moses, as it could not have been otherwise in the case of any other historian similarly situated. Astruc had only to open his Herodotus, and the truth of this assertion would stare him in the face. That is not a discovery. It is merely the recognition of a matter of fact, which is the universal experience of historians, and without which there is no history.

That which is novel, in the ideas of Astruc and Eichhorn, is the way in which they describe their two principal documents, the way in which they define them. What calls for remark is, not that they should assert two sources, but that they should maintain that the first main document is that of Elohim, and the second, that of Jahveh. That principle of distribution is highly debatable, so much so, indeed, that the Critics of the present day have given it up. They have realised, for instance, that a definition which makes use of the names of God, as the principle of distribution, cannot be maintained, in view of the fact that the Septuagint supports the Massoretic Text in this reference only incompletely. As a matter of fact, Elohist and Jahvist are now no more than names, or, as I heard from a Critic lately, "labels," which, by convention, so far designate the authors. But these designations are no longer used in harmony with the etymological sense of the terms. The result is that the attribution of

passages to authors is no longer determined by those two names. If there is a supremely Elohist chapter in Genesis, it is the first chapter, that of the Creation. For all that, the Critics now tell us this chapter belongs not to the Elohist, but to the Priestly Code, a post-exilic document. Yet, strange to say, if we ask the most recent Critics to tell us what exactly characterises their respective documents, they will tell us "that the Jahvist owes his name to the fact that from his first page he copiously uses the name Jahveh. The Elohist draws his designation from the fact that, up to the calling of Moses, he systematically avoids giving God the name of Jahveh, so as thus to escape an anachronism." [1] The Elohist of the Critics of to-day differs much from that of Astruc. The Elohist used to be regarded as the first of the distinct documents discerned in Genesis, and was thought to form part of a writing which extended far beyond Genesis. This, for a long time, was considered as the most ancient document in the Pentateuch, and was sometimes called the fundamental document (*Grundschrift*); and, by reason of the name given in it to God, it was, in those days, as a rule, spoken of as the Elohist. Science, however, discovered the existence of another document using the same terminology—Elohim, thatis—in speaking of God, and thus it became necessary to set up a distinction between two Elohists—the first Elohist and the second Elohist. Inasmuch as

[1] Gautier, *Introduction à l'Ancien Testament*, 33, 35.

the second Elohist turns out to be older than the first, critics have given to the first Elohist the name of the Priestly Code—a code which, after long discussion, they have agreed to place after the Exile. The first chapter of Genesis has, they say, the qualities of the texts of which the Priestly Code is made up, and so the Critics attribute the first chapter of Genesis to this document.

Thus, the discovery of Astruc is completely turned upside down. Moses is no longer regarded as the author of the Pentateuch; it is wrong to distinguish the fundamental documents according to the name given to God in them. These documents are all posterior to Moses; their presence, as distinct documents, is recognised as manifest throughout the whole of the Pentateuch; they even penetrate the Book of Joshua, so that they talk to us now, not of the Pentateuch, but of the Hexateuch. Besides, there are in the Hexateuch several authors whom Astruc failed to distinguish, the recognition of which we owe to modern science; there is first the Priestly Code, then there is the Deuteronomist, an author who, in spite of what is in the most formal manner told us in Deuteronomy itself, lived in the time of Josiah, and wrote probably about the year 621 B.C. Then, finally, there is the redactor, a mysterious personage who brought together all these documents, and gave to the books their present form. One may say that in certain parts the redactor is the true author; for, by the help of fragments taken from

here and there, he creates situations which certainly did not exist in that form in any of the sources from which he drew.

The method of the Critics, which I shall examine only as it affects the Pentateuch, consists primarily in dismembering the text throughout, in representing it, not as the work of an author whose name and date are given us by tradition or by the text itself, but as a collection of fragments due to different authors of very different epochs and origin, but whose historical existence they affirm with the same kind of assurance with which we are wont to speak of Thucydides or of Livy. There is, then, no weight to be attached to the circumstance that the four books which come after Genesis are, according to the testimony of the books themselves, the word of Moses, or sometimes even what he personally wrote. The Critics have altered all that. It is no longer a question, as with Astruc or Eichhorn, touching the sources of which Moses, like every historian, made use. He made use of no sources, for the simple reason that he wrote nothing, and what might have been considered as his, are merely the literary compositions of personages who, we do not know why, thought themselves under an obligation to relate what had been the origin of Israel, and to write of Israel's patriarchs. The most ancient of these writers was, they say, the Jahvist, a member of the tribe of Judah, who lived not earlier than the date at which the Kingdom was

divided into two. How did he come to know the things that he thus relates? Where did he get his information respecting what he tells? These are questions with which the Critics trouble not themselves at all—no more than with another question, which of itself is a serious one: How is it that (according to the Critics) the Decalogue, the fundamental law of the religion of Israel, has come down to us not at all from Moses, nor even as from anyone adhering to the temple and to the worship of Jerusalem and to the tribe of Judah, but from the Elohist, an Ephraimite who appertained to the Kingdom which had separated itself from Judah, and had set up a form of worship which was in direct opposition to the Decalogue, the worship of the golden calf—a flagrant violation of the second commandment?

It is a construction which is quite turned aside from the ideas of Astruc, that the modern Critics maintain and carefully develop. The French physician distinguished the sources according to the names given in the several sections of Genesis to God, but it was the sources only that he characterised after that manner, and, necessarily, the sources must have been due to other authors than Moses, since they were times anterior to Moses that were in that case under consideration. What, in reference to Astruc, it is possible to question, is the correctness of the principle according to which he classified his documents. It is possible on another, and different, principle, to

explain the differences in the names of God in all the instances in which the names appear, on a principle which does not imply that the record which we have, say, of the life of Abraham, or of that of Joseph, is in each case due to several different authors. I repeat it: the idea of Astruc was merely an interpretation offered of certain phenomena, a conception which he, for his part, adopted as true, but one which has by no means been proved as true.

With greater reason may that last remark be said of the system of the Critics as a whole, of the analysis which they have made of the Pentateuch in its entirety, the principles of which they extend to the whole Old Testament.

Their fundamental principle is this: There are here several authors: it is impossible that it should be otherwise, for the text does not conform to what we have the right, say they, to expect if it were a case of a single author: we find in the text what we consider to be contradictions, repetitions that absolutely serve no useful purpose, chronological difficulties that make it impossible to suppose unity of authorship.

A number of authors, they say, were engaged upon this work. The authors vary, according as we follow one Critic or another; but the existence of such authors is taken as a proved historical fact. If the text is not in harmony with this point of view of theirs, the text must be corrected.

Now, there you have the critical method which reigns supreme, not only in what concerns the study of the Old Testament, but in what concerns all that touches historical documents, ancient and modern—particularly where the German influence has affected the minds of students. For this critical method is essentially German. The principle is this: In the study of a document, what gives law is not what the document itself says, but the idea or the theory to which the reading of the document gives rise in the mind of the student. That idea it is that is regarded as stable and indisputable—the norm according to which the document must be judged. It will, of course, become necessary to make the document square always with the theory, to make it, at any cost, suit the theory; and in order to secure that, these Critics will not hesitate to prune the document, to purify it from all supposed interpolations, to pass condemnation upon certain parts, and over against these parts to exalt unduly what others affirm.

Nor is that all: If the document itself does not suffice to prove the thesis of the Critics, they will presume the existence of other documents, as the theory may require, or failing documents, then authors. And this is emphatically the case, relatively to the Old Testament. It is absolutely necessary to discover several different authors for the Pentateuch. Nor is it difficult to discover them, they have only to create them. We have

no proper *data* whatsoever as to who these authors were, or as to the time in which they lived, or in respect of their names, their date, or what it was that moved them to write. It matters not: Do we not know enough on that score from what we have been led to conclude, in their regard, from the text itself, even if this conclusion in many cases directly contradicts what the text tells us? And these imaginary authors have so little of the character of historical personages, that each critic can fashion as many of them as he wishes, and as he likes. I observe, for example, that in the second chapter of Genesis there are, according to the Centenary Bible, three Jahvists. Again, in the "Rainbow" Bible the Editor of Joshua, Dr. Bennett (*o*), recognises in that particular book two Jahvists whose contributions lie close one to another; two Elohists similarly placed in regard to one another; a document, JE, which is the fusion of the foregoing Jahvists and Elohists—a fusion realised through the activities of several redactors—what he calls the prophetic narrative of the Hexateuch, where J and E are so deftly blended that literary criticism is unequal to the task of separating them. Then come additions in the spirit of the Deuteronomist, and, finally, there is the Priestly Code, of which there are two layers, representing two successive editions. The later layer is dated between 440 and 400 B.C., while the earlier layer, the main body, is dated at about the

year 500 B.C., and is supposed to have been composed in Babylon. It is necessary to add to these certain other fragments, in respect of which it is not possible to say to whom they should be attributed. All that amounts to giving, at least, nine authors to the Book of Joshua. And for all there are so many, yet Dr. Bennett has overlooked one worker, and that for us the most important of all—the final redactor, he who brought together all these documents, and, of them, made the Book of Joshua—he who had the skill to procure the two Jahvists from Jerusalem or from some part of Judea, the two Elohists from Samaria, the two editions of the Priestly Code either from Babylon or from Jerusalem, and then from all these to compose the book which bears the name of the successor of Moses! This final redactor is the veritable author of the book. Without the labours of this unknown author—respecting whom the only thing we know is that he could not have lived before the fourth century B.C.—all we should have had of Joshua were but mere fragments going back to dates that are more than four centuries apart, and scattered, at that, through several regions of the earth.

That, then, is the nature of the method of the Higher Criticism, a form of criticism which results in overthrowing entirely logical order in the study of ancient documents. When the Higher Critics take in hand a writing such as is given us in the Pentateuch, the conception of a plurality of

authors, belonging to diverse periods, is not with them of the nature of a conclusion to which an examination of the work necessarily leads. Plurality of authors is taken as the point of departure, the preconceived idea according to which it is necessary to judge the document. From the first, unity of authorship is excluded. They find it, by all means, necessary to discover diverse authors, writing, each from his own point of view, in different localities, at periods often far apart—and all that, be it remembered, in explanation of a perfectly simple narrative, which unfolds itself in the most natural manner, and without there being anything there fitted to make one think that the narrative is essentially a collection of pieces that were of very dissimilar origin. It matters little that the text itself is altogether out of harmony with this conception of the Critics; the Critics are quite equal to the venture of disavowing or of correcting the text wheresoever that is necessary. It is but one of those obstacles which, as one of them has been telling us, the mighty floodtide of the Higher Criticism will, without trouble, sweep aside as it triumphantly moves along.

Inasmuch as the existence of those authors does not rest on any historical proof whatsoever, but rests altogether on the interpretations which the Critics put upon the text, or on that which they imagine they find there—that interpretation being in many cases in formal opposition to that which

the text itself declares—it is clear that their supposed historicity must be regarded as an absolutely artificial creation, a vast network of hypotheses built on a completely subjective foundation. After the manner now explained, the Critics have brought into being a crowd of authors, whose characteristics and activities are out of all keeping with the circumstances and usages of the time in which they are supposed to have been active.

Their Method Tested.

Re Books.—The Critics start from a conception of written matter which is certainly erroneous. The most ancient writings presuppose the spoken word; and the actual writing serves, in the first place, to fix sounds previously heard, and then to recall what had been said, what one had once heard, and should wish to be able to utter again. It results from this that the earliest writings are only the word spoken, with its repetitions, with its contradictions, whether these are real or only apparent—a word that, in many cases, seems to lack in logical order, or to be characterised by a want of order in the manner in which the ideas are presented. The Critics, on the other hand, invariably start from the idea of a book in the strict and modern sense of the term, regarding it as a purely mental product, and made for its own sake, following, too, a definite plan, and having the reader always in view. That, however, is a

development which Moses and the Prophets had not realised, since, in either case, they only committed to writing what they had at first spoken to the people. In their conception the reader will be one who, with a loud voice, will reproduce that which he sees written. To read with a low voice is, in Assyrian and Babylonian, expressed by a term which literally means, not, to read, but, to see. To read, with the ancients, means always, to read with a loud voice, whether an audience is present or not. That is the case even when one reads merely for one's own sake, as in the case of the eunuch of Queen Candace, whom Philip, as he drew near to his chariot, overheard reading the prophet Isaiah. Even to this day the case is not different in that country. I am not referring to scholars, to men of culture—in their case it goes without saying. But you may often, in the streets of Cairo, pass before a *boab* [a porter], sitting at the door of a house, and hear him, as he occupies his time, read with a loud voice, either the Koran, or some other such book.

A book in the modern sense is brought under rules of composition which are inapplicable to a work such as we have in the Pentateuch. The upshot is that modern scholars, whose minds are saturated with the precise laws which should rule the construction of a modern book, when they find themselves face to face with a document which complies so badly with the kind of demands which they think themselves entitled to make

upon it, conclude that the difficulties that thus arise are capable of solution only on the theory that the document is a pell-mell constructed out of several books, portions of which someone has taken and brought together, as stones are taken to form a mosaic. The Critics distinguish, by different colours, all these several books, which, they say, constitute the resultant text, and thereupon proceed in part to recompose the original books, making the idea which the Critics suppose to have guided the authors of the several original documents the principle of a new reconstruction. In the case of one of these books, the dominant principle and ground of distinction is taken to be its legislative character; for a second and third, the prevalence of either Elohim or of Jahveh is regarded as the principle; for a fourth the distinguishing mark appears to be that the author or redactor thereof united these two names, and what relates to them, so well together, that it is now impossible to separate them; and so the distribution goes on in respect of all the literary creations which are judged to be necessary postulates by the Critics. And they claim to have so reconstituted the underlying documents that, as distinct pieces, these reconstructed documents ought to be taken as our primary authorities. If the common text does not agree with the ideas for which these reconstituted documents are made to stand, why, of course, it seems to be the text that is at fault; it cannot possibly

be quite correct. It may possibly be completely wrong.

Over against this reconstruction which the Critics give us as though it were something scarcely open to criticism, I maintain that a document like the Pentateuch, which is, in the main, a collection of the words of Moses, committed to writing either by himself or by one of his hearers, cannot possibly be based on books, or consist merely of fragments of books. Besides, to speak at that period of books, in the modern sense, is to be guilty by several centuries of a flagrant anachronism.

Re Authors.—Along with these underlying books, the Critics are bound to postulate the men who wrote them. They must call into being quite a crowd of writers of an altogether special quality, a class of writers of the knowledge of whose existence the Old Testament is innocent. They are a kind of composers who are spontaneous writers, who write for the sake of writing, amateurs, full of admiration of things remembered from of old, and of the tradition of their fathers, which they reduce each to his own peculiar point of view. Thus, we have the Jahvist whose predilections were for the name of Jahveh, and felt disposed both to relate the history of Abraham, and to describe the intercourse which Abraham had had with Jahveh, and in particular to give an account of the covenant which Jahveh concluded with Abraham, and Jahveh's choice of Abraham and

of his seed after him. All that is a matter of the greatest importance for the history of Israel. It is, in fact, its basis. Nevertheless, a century later, there arises another author whose ideas are entirely different to those of the Jahvist, and who, according to the meaning that the Critics put upon his words, gives us to understand that what the Jahvist declares as truth could not possibly be regarded as according to fact, for the simple reason that the name of Jahveh was unknown to Abraham, and to his descendants too, down to the time of Moses. Consequently all that the Jahvist wrote, all that was incorporated as from him into Genesis, rests on erroneous *data*, and that, of course, makes void its value as history. Take away Jahveh from the history of Abraham, and then ask yourself: how much of the history of Abraham remains?

Still further, the Critics treat the supposed writers of the underlying documents just as they treat Moses. The several names assigned to these authors by no means stand, in the estimation of the Critics, for just so many individual writers. The Jahvist is not for certain Critics a single individual writer. I revert to the example which I submitted on an earlier page, that of Joshua, as the subject is treated in the "Rainbow" Bible. Dr. Bennett does not in terms mention such an author as the Jahvist at all. With him it is the Judaic document that one hears of, and in that document he recognises two successive strata distant in time

from one another by a hundred years, and the two strata are made manifest to us by the help of different colours. But he gives us no assurance that even these strata represent each the work of one single author. Besides, in regard to each of these two strata, we find that italics are occasionally made use of, and these italics indicate fragments that at a date later than the primary strata were incorporated with the several strata, together with changes or additions which some editors coming after made in the text. The matter thus subdivides into the infinitely small. The same method is pursued in respect of the Elohist, of the Priestly Code, and of Deuteronomy. This last work is assigned not to 621 B.C., to the period, that is, of Josiah, as most of the Critics maintain, but to the period 570–540 B.C. We ask ourselves, Who were the writers that brought together and fused these several documents into one, and caused the knowledge of their own individual existence to be obliterated in the process? For example, there is a document quoted as JE, in which the two Jahvists and the two Elohists are so blended that the Critics themselves find it impossible to decompose them. This JE document is assigned to about 630 B.C. What reason was there to cite, sometimes two distinct documents, which yet must have been exceedingly like one another, and at other times to cite the document which results from their fusion?

If we reckon a dozen authors, which is by no

means an exaggerated number, to whom we owe the Hexateuch, we must, with the authorship of the whole Old Testament in view, add to these the anonymous authors of the Book of Ezra, of Nehemiah, of the Lamentations of Jeremiah, of the most of the Psalms, of the Song of Solomon, of Ecclesiastes, of the greater part of Proverbs, of more than the half of Isaiah. None of these books is due to the author whose name it bears—a remark that has to be made in regard of "the great mass of the Old Testament, written as it was by authors whose names and exact relationship to these writings are matters which have fallen into oblivion" (Briggs). In that way the Critics imagine, from the ninth to the fifth century B.C., a list of writers or of literary men, all of whom have remained anonymous, whose names are absolutely unknown; and a similar remark falls, of course, to be made in respect of the date at which they wrote, the place of their birth, and the localities where their activities were carried on. We have, so far as they are concerned, only what, according to the Critics, is given us in the text, and these are *data* in respect of which the Critics are far from being agreed among themselves. All external testimony relative to their existence is a blank.

In this way the entire Old Testament forms a mass of literature which has come down to us under a false appearance. You imagine, say, that a large number of these books were written by the prophets, that is to say, by the men who in the

several books are said to have received commandment from Jahveh so to speak and act, and who wrote at the period at which they are known to have lived. Undeceive yourself. The case is not as you thought at all: these books are the product of authors whom I cannot call anything else than underground dwellers, for no one saw them or heard them, and nothing, within what is known to us of the history of Israel, attests their existence. They are made manifest to the world in the form of men that take to themselves such names as those of Moses or of Joshua, in order to give to their writings an appearance of authority of which they themselves are destitute. Do not, then, think that it was Moses who gave to the Israelites the commandment, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." It emanated from a juridical and priestly school of the post-exilian period, as did also the solemn notification that accompanies it, "I am Jahveh." And that touching farewell of Joshua to the people—"As for me and my house, we shall serve Jahveh"—it is not in virtue of Joshua, or of any of his hearers, that we become acquainted with it, but through a certain Ephraimite of the eighth century B.C. As for the urgent charge to continue faithful to the law of Moses, seeing that that law of Moses came into existence, according to our critical authorities, only with the author of Deuteronomy, about 621 or 570 B.C., one can scarcely understand how Joshua could have given commandment concerning it.

These two examples, taken at random, are enough to show what the Higher Criticism makes of the Old Testament, and especially of the Hexateuch.

Re Sources.—We now go on to examine briefly some of the documents which the Critics claim to have discovered in the text of the Pentateuch, but which appear to us to be merely their creations.

If we consider a work like the Pentateuch, which —I cannot repeat it too often—has not the character of a book, or of several books, composed according to a definite preconceived plan, but is a collection of independent tablets, written in the course of half a century by one and the same author, it need not appear strange if there be easily discovered therein important dissimilarities, it may be of style, or it may be in what we call points of view. In the course of his long experience, Moses found himself living under conditions that were astonishingly varied : the life of a man brought up at the Court of Pharaoh with a fellow feeling for the oppression endured by his fellow-Hebrews was different from that of the fugitive who found shelter in the house of Jethro, as that again was from the experience of a leader bringing a whole nation out of Egypt, and legislating for the same. When, then, he committed to writing what he had before spoken, or when he wrote out for the benefit of future generations, from sources that were at his disposal, what he knew of the origins of Israel, or when he committed to writing the commandments of Jahveh, commandments that were meant

to embody the constitution under which the people were to be afterwards governed, it is evident that, in keeping with those varied circumstances, his language would suffer modifications. His style would change according as he was, with the dry and positive accent of the legislator, formulating laws; as it would, again, as he celebrated with a song of victory the passage through the Red Sea; and yet again as he described an episode in the life of Abraham or in that of Joseph. By choosing out of the Pentateuch all the passages that have strong resemblances in style, and then reuniting, in different books, those passages that for likeness of style go together, it is easy to form a different book every time, and even to assign to each book an author or even several authors.

It is in this way that the Critics have put together what they regard as the most important document in the Pentateuch, what (although Wellhausen (o^1) used to consider it as the oldest document of all, and it was called the fundamental document, *die Grundschrift*, the first Elohist) is now, on the contrary, reckoned to be the most recent document of all, as posterior, in fact, to the Exile, and named the Priestly document or Code P. The Priestly Code of the Critics is, above all, a legal document, which, at the same time, serves as the historical framework of the Pentateuch. The principal object of this document (P), which, of course, embraces whole books, as Leviticus, is to give an account of the statutes, of

the laws of which the origin is here shown. That which, strictly speaking, is history, appears in this document only as that history is necessary in order to explain how occasions for the fixing of the laws arose, or, with a view to placing these Divine institutions within the framework of such grand historical events as the Creation, the Flood, the call of Abraham, the settling down of the Hebrews in Egypt. With the exception of the Creation-narrative (which one would think ought to have been conceded to the Elohist) and the covenant with Abraham (Gen. xvii.), all those grand historical events are, broadly speaking, related very briefly, sometimes in two or three lines only. But the exposition of the laws is full, and remarkable for its precision, its juridical exactness; the language tends to be dry and monotonous, the author being disposed to make use of a large number of technical terms, and he must be credited with research, reflection, and extensive knowledge, and withal he shows a strong tendency towards the development of a system and schematic forms.[1]

A very important point for the Critics is the fact that the Priestly Code avoids the use of the name of Jahveh up to the moment at which they claim that this name was revealed to Moses and to the Israelites. "P never uses this name before Ex. vi., where the writer relates how God revealed the name to Moses."[2] Nevertheless,

[1] See Dillmann, *Genesis*, p. ix.

[2] *The Centenary Bible.* Note on Gen. xvii. 1.

one of the chapters that are assigned to P (Gen. xvii.) begins with these words : " And when Abram was ninety years old and nine, Jahveh appeared to Abram." But the Critics are not embarrassed. The text is at fault. At this place an interpolation, they say, occurs : " It was doubtless a redactor that introduced that name there." [1] In all that goes before of the history of Abraham, from the moment that Abraham was commanded to quit Ur of the Chaldees, it is, all the time, Jahveh that speaks ; and especially there is that significant passage in which Jahveh reveals Himself so clearly to Abram, saying : " I am Jahveh that brought thee out of Ur of the Chaldees " (Gen. xv. 7). All that is in formal contradiction with the ideas of the Critics. P, in the form in which they claim to have discovered that document, is ignorant of the name of Jahveh down to the time of Moses. Therefore it is impossible that the chapter which describes the covenant with Abram should have originally begun with this word (xvii. 1) ; the redactor to whom the Critics attribute the alteration, thought himself under an obligation here to imitate the Jahvist who wrote nearly all the history of Abraham.

But we owe to this redactor, who cannot have lived before the fourth century B.C., an interpolation which is still more important. It is that passage (xv. 7) in which Jahveh makes Himself known *by His Name* to Abraham. The averment, say the

[1] *The Centenary Bible.* Note on Gen. xvii. 1.

Critics, is not possible. The name Jahveh became known only in the time of Moses, and, of course, they cannot afford to admit a term of that character, amounting to the negation of one of the foundations of their system, a matter of fundamental importance, on which is based a doctrine of plurality of authors animated by diverse motives. So it becomes necessary to reject a part of the text which can only have been put there by the redactor, the author who gave the final touch to the Pentateuch, and who evidently had a wish to give a certain degree of homogeneity to the history of Abraham. We have here two striking examples of the method of the Critics, in keeping with my exposition of their method as that was given on a former page. What is determinative is not the text, but the interpretation which the Critics put upon it, or the ideas to which the text gives birth in their minds. The text refuses to be in accord with their ideas—well, it is its fault, they must accordingly reject it or give it the form they wish.

"The Elohist belonged to the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, and wrote about 750 B.C. He gets his name from the fact that, up to the call of Moses, in order to avoid an anachronism, he systematically abstains from giving God the name of Jahveh" (Gautier). His is the book of Israelitish legends (*das israelitische Sagengeschichtsbuch*). The writer, it is said, draws partly upon ancient written documents, but still more upon oral tradition, as that was handed down among the

Israelitish tribes other than Judah. His narrative bears the character of popular tradition. It is rich in details, in information that has the appearance of being archaic. It is a cause of regret that it was not preserved in completer form. (Dillmann.)

The third, the Jahvist, owes his name to the fact that "from its first pages the writer freely uses the name Jahveh." Its provenance is Judah. Dillmann (*p*) discovers, in what the Jahvist relates concerning the history of the earliest ages, in what he relates of the creation of man, and of the genealogy of Noah, a clear affinity with P; and, even in the Jahvist life of Abraham, there are, according to Dillmann, portions which are common to P and J, as, for example, where the subject-matter is the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah. I confess I do not know what to make of this: I see in chap. xix., which gives an account of that destruction, only one single narrative which the Critics are generally wont to attribute in its entirety to the Jahvist, up, that is to say, to ver. 29, which alone is pointed out as belonging to P. If the whole narrative is common to the two authors, or rather, if P, which is by much the more recent author, has borrowed here from J, then there is no reason to claim that P never makes use of the name Jahveh before the call of Moses; for throughout that chapter God is not spoken of otherwise than as Jahveh, save, of course, in ver. 29, which latter circumstances, I suppose, led to this section being attributed to P.

It is an easy matter, however, to be convinced that this ver. 29 is not the sequel of what goes before, but the beginning of a new episode concerning Lot—it was the first clause in the tablet which related that episode.

That same Critic from whom I have borrowed the above characterisation of J, whose right to speak will not be called in question, adds that in the history of the patriarchs, especially in what concerns Jacob and Joseph, the relationship between the two documents J and E is so close that after chap. xvii., J contains some narratives that are absolutely parallel with those of E, to such a degree of closeness that the Critics are compelled to admit that the one depends upon the other. According to Dillmann, it is the Jahvist that is dependent upon the Elohist, an idea which runs counter to the view commonly accepted among the Critics, who, as a rule, hold that the Judaist is older than the Ephraimite. The writer from Judah, according to Dillmann, could only have come to know the legends connected with the kingdom of the Ten Tribes by the help of the writer from Ephraim, and was obliged to work upon the written material of which the Elohist had also availed himself. Along with that, J would have had for his history of Moses and of Joshua sources that were still older and more reliable, and, besides, traditions that were handed down within Judah itself, with the result that we can say that J presents us with a legendary Judaic

history. Dillmann does not assign a date to J, but nowadays Critics, with practical unanimity, place it *c.* 850 B.C.

All the commentators of this school insist on the intimate relationship which exists as between these two documents, including those commentators who regard J and E as respectively composite documents, due, that is, not to two individual writers, but to several schools, "two series of narrators animated by common conceptions, following a common literary method, and transmitting a common form of tradition from one generation to another" (Skinner) (p^1). It is reckoned even that the tone of the narrative changes simultaneously with the two writers. But I do not find any of those who are struck with this unity, with this agreement between J and E, mention that these two documents contradict one another in the most absolute manner, and *that* on a fundamental point, the keystone, in fact, of the building of the history of Israel. The Jahvist tells us that the name of Jahveh was known to men since the creation of the world, that as early as the time of Enosh, Adam's grandson, men called upon the name of Jahveh; that Jahveh made Himself known in a special manner to Abraham and to his family; that He entered into a covenant with him and his descendants. That could not be, says the Elohist, according to the interpretation which the Critics put upon his words, for the name of Jahveh was known only since the time of Moses, and, in this

matter, it is to the Elohist we must, it seems, give credit. We shall have to return to this contradiction, although it is a matter that does not appear to be of any importance in the eyes of the Critics, seeing that they do not pay any attention to the matter.

Elohim and Jahveh as Criteria.

I should like to show by means of two examples only how this method of the Higher Critics works out in the actual reconstruction of the two documents J and E.

Elohim is a general term answering exactly to our word God. It is an expression for the Deity, as well as for a particular god. Jahveh is the proper name of the God of Abraham and of his posterity, the national God of Israel. It results from that that the Jahvist, if he has occasion for it, may, anterior to Ex. vi., use the term Elohim, while the converse statement would not hold good for the Elohist. If we read the first two chapters of Genesis without any preconceived idea, and simply hearken to what these chapters tell us, we learn that Elohim is the creator of the universe, of the heavens and of the stars which shine therein, of the earth and all that inhabit it, man being regarded only as one of the objects of the natural creation, not differing in that respect from the lower animals. Chap. ii. is occupied with the creation of man; it is man alone, and not nature as such, that from

this point interests the author, and he tells us that God in His communications with man, in His actions which have man specifically in view, is Jahveh. Jahveh, who appears later on as the God of Abraham, is, to begin with, the God of man, it is under that name that mankind invoke Him: and, in order to indicate clearly that Jahveh is one and the same with God the Creator, that there is only the one God, the writer ascribes to Him the double name Jahveh Elohim. It was the simplest way to express the grand truth which is the fundamental basis of the religion of Israel. There is only one Elohim whose proper name, even for the first man, is Jahveh. Thus it is that in the course of chaps. ii. and iii. (so far as the serpent is not the speaker), we meet with the double form Jahveh Elohim. We cannot lay too much weight on the high significance of the truth that issues from the combination of these two words, a truth which is the corner-stone of the religion of Israel and of our own.

Nevertheless, according to the Critics, we must not think of placing this consideration in the balance with the theory which contradicts it. There is a Jahvist and an Elohist, but the use of Jahveh Elohim is not in keeping with the manner of either. Where the Jahvist appears for the first time, the name Jahveh ought to be found all alone. The text of Gen. ii. and iii. is, therefore, so far at fault. The term Elohim is an interpolation. We are able to correct the text, how-

ever, with the help of the redactor, who is so helpful on so many an occasion, to whom, in fact, we owe this grand truth, or—and I am quoting without comment—it is "to his combination of two sources, one of which (J1) calls God, Jahveh, from the beginning of the world, while the other (J2) calls Him Elohim up to ver. 4,"[1] that we owe it. The critical method, as seen at work, at and from the beginning of Genesis, teaches us, by example, how we may expect the method to be applied to the entire text, and, in particular, how it will set to the reconstruction of the work of the writer whose name is the Jahvist.

We pass on now to the Elohist, and, in order to consider the manner of attribution in his case, we move on to what is related of the history of Joseph in the house of Potiphar. The whole of this chapter (xxxix.) is, without the exception of a single word, attributed by Astruc to the Jahvist. In the "Rainbow" Bible the matter of this chapter is displayed under three different colours; what represents the Jahvist taking up almost the whole chapter, while a few words are ascribed to the redactor, and three or four phrases to the Elohist. The writer tells us that Joseph was the object of the special blessing of Jahveh, and that is easily comprehensible; for, was not Jahveh the God of Jacob, who extended His protection and favours to the son of the patriarch? Besides, the name of Jahveh is the

[1] *The Centenary Bible, ad hoc.*

only name given to God in this chapter, save in that one utterance of Joseph in ver. 9: "How then can I sin against God?"

Kautzsch and Socin, whose text of Genesis, so far as the most of the present-day Critics are concerned, has the force of law, attribute to the Elohist, within this chapter, fragments of two verses. There is first the conclusion of ver. 3: "His master saw . . . that Jahveh made all that he did to prosper in his hand."[1] Similarly in ver. 5 the words, "and the blessing of Jahveh was upon all that he had, in the house and in the field," are ascribed to the Elohist. Behold, then, the Elohist, who in this instance has become a Jahvist! although the Elohist knew very well that the name of Jahveh was "the exclusive attribute of the God of Israel but taking commencement only from a fixed point of time in the history of Israel" (Gautier), and that a time long posterior to Joseph. He is thus of his own will inconsistent with himself.

Joseph was then thrown into prison. The same author who related what had led to that severe treatment being meted out to the sufferer, goes on, so one would think, to develop his narrative, and to tell us what was the manner of Joseph's life in prison, and how he went forth out of it. All that took place in Egypt; the conversations which are put on record took place between Joseph and

[1] *The Centenary Bible*, which attributes this whole verse to J, omits the word Jahveh towards the end of the verse, *ad hoc*.

the Egyptians, and were, without doubt, carried on in the Egyptian language. Now in these conversations the term God, very naturally, appears repeatedly. Thus, Joseph assures the butler and the baker that the interpretation of their dreams belongs to God. He will use similar language to Pharaoh. The idea of God, in the general sense of the Deity, was one that was familiar to the Egyptians, and to express it they made use of a word which corresponds exactly to Elohim, the word *nouti*, or, with the article, *phnouti*. When Joseph spoke of God to Pharaoh, or even to the wife of Potiphar, he could not use any other word. It was the usual word for God in Egypt, and the Egyptians understood it. If he had said Jahveh, they would not have known what he meant. They would have answered as Pharaoh did at a later period (Ex. v. 1), "Who is Jahveh?" So Joseph was forced to use the word *nouti*, the Egyptian equivalent of Elohim. And, henceforth, this condition of things will determine the form of the Divine name in all the chapters that bear upon the life of Joseph in Egypt. The name of Jahveh will not appear in them, we shall meet only with the name Elohim.

But then, say the Critics, chaps. xl., xli., which are occupied with certain dreams and with the exaltation of Joseph, cannot be ascribed to the same author as the preceding chapter, which described the life of the young man in the house of Potiphar. In chap. xxxix. the divine name is

Jahveh throughout. In chaps. xl., xli., although the circumstances were such that the speakers could use only Elohim, the author must be some other one than the Jahvist, he must be another author; and, for all that, chaps. xliii.–xlv., which Astruc logically ascribed to the Elohist, are in the estimation of present-day Critics, reckoned as the work of the Jahvist; although not once does the name of Jahveh appear in these chapters, and although the name Elohim only is met with in it. See there, then, how the critical method creates at will authors for the production of the Pentateuch, and see what is the kind of coherence which is to be found in the conclusions to which it leads!

Supposed Contradictions.

We are told of contradictions, repetitions that are perfectly useless, chronological and other difficulties which are said to be incompatible with the idea of unity of authorship, and, on these objections to unity, the Critics establish the existence of unknown authors as need requires. It would be interesting to ascertain how many of these difficulties are due to want of appreciation of what the text itself is fitted to teach, or of the circumstances in which the supposed difficulty was written. For example, one of the so-called useless repetitions is found in what concerns the descendants of Shem, whose genealogy occurs twice with frameworks which are not exactly alike (x. and xi.). But it needs only that we consider the aim of the

book as a whole in order to see that this repetition is necessary. Moses had Abraham, with whom Jahveh entered into a covenant, in view throughout. He traced the origin of this patriarch up to the Creation. His narrative brings us down to the Flood; after the going forth from the ark the writer shows us how humanity was reconstituted from the descendants of the three sons of Noah (x. 32). But instead of their spreading out all over the world, mankind were cleaving to one another as one mass, and were proceeding to build the tower of Babel. Thereupon Jahveh scattered them abroad through the confusion of languages. The question then arises: where were the ancestors of Abraham to be found amongst a people spread abroad throughout all the world? The answer is that they are to be found in a family of the descendants of Shem, even in that of his son, Arphaxad. That is why Moses found it necessary to take up the genealogy of Shem the second time, and to follow it down to the time of Terah, the father of Abraham. This repetition, so far from being useless, is absolutely necessary, it is the leading thread that carries us down to Abraham.

This latter genealogy the Critics attribute to P. As to the former (in chap. x.), it is a sheer pell-mell of Priestly Code, Jahvist and redactor. We pass from one author to another in an absolutely arbitrary manner. It is an arrangement due to the redactor which does not concern itself even with verisimilitude. Thus at ver. 20, P tells us: "These

are the sons of Ham." Now a goodly number of the sons of Ham are supposed to be due to J, and others to the redactor, who is later than P. Consequently the phrase of P, "These are the descendants of Ham," was meant to be applicable to a genealogy which was not identical with that given us in the text. P's phrase is incongruous even with the phrase going before. Such, then, are some of the liberties that criticism allows itself, but of which it strictly forbids its adversaries to avail themselves. We have, be it noted, in this 10th chapter, according to the Critics, one of the compositions which we owe to the redactor, so that from it we can form an idea of other compositions of his, where he makes use of earlier writings as he likes, and follows out a plan of his own.

When he was about to die, Jacob blessed his twelve sons; and the writer, after putting upon record this benediction, which is given in the form of poetry, resumes his narrative thus: "All these are the twelve tribes of Israel: and this it is that their father spake unto them." It is impossible, say the Critics, that these words should have one and the same author with the benediction, for the writer speaks here of tribes, when, as a matter of fact, the benediction was concerned not with tribes, but with the sons of Jacob. But, surely, Moses found himself in presence of the twelve tribes, whom it fell to him to lead to Canaan; it is the tribes that he addresses, for them it is that he writes. Ought he not, in the circumstances, to show to

the Israelites that they were the descendants of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob, the posterity of the twelve sons of the patriarch ; and therefore that to them belong these blessings, both those that Jahveh spoke to Abraham and those that Jacob spoke to his sons ? " All these are the twelve tribes of Israel : and this it is that their father spake unto them, and blessed them ; every one according to his blessing he blessed them. And he charged them . . . bury me with my fathers." That, then, is a narrative which is perfectly in accord with itself, and for which there is no need for a reference to different authors, whether it be the redactor, whom the Critics find so useful and so helpful, or the Priestly Code. But they must submit themselves to the exigencies of their theory, whilst we, who read these words in their natural sense, discover only one author who gives a résumé of the bendiction of Jacob, and along with that teaches the Israelites, who hear him, that they are the heirs of the promises made to the sons of Jacob. After what concerns the blessing, the narrative proceeds, quite in the natural order, to give an account of the instructions given by Jacob as to the way in which he wishes to be buried.

We have shown elsewhere that the history of Joseph must have been written in his own time, and probably by his own orders, and under his own superintendence, as the biographies of the great lords of Egypt were wont to be written. That was the last source of which Moses availed himself

before proceeding to narrate events which he had himself witnessed. I am inclined to think that that blessing of Jacob was committed to writing by one of his numerous audience at the time it was uttered. Moses rehearsed it at a later date, and it stands as one of the pieces which, with the rest of Genesis, made it possible for him to explain to his fellow-Israelites that they were the people of God. According to the Critics, this was the work of the older Jahvist, J1, one of those authors that belong to their relief company, whom they spring upon us when they are at a loss how to assign any passage in a way that would be in keeping with the more usual marks according to which passages are distributed.

There is still another author who plays a very important part among the books that follow Genesis —I mean, the Deuteronomist. We shall deal with him when we take up the subject-matter of the law.

The Grand Critical Objection.

Before speaking of the authors that have brought together these documents so as to construct the Pentateuch such as we now know it, I should like to examine what M. Doumergue, without any exaggeration, speaks of as the grand objection to unity of authorship put forward by the Higher Critics. It is of this form: God was not known to the Israelites under the name of Jahveh before the time of Moses, as chaps. iii. and vi. of Exodus show us. As Kuenen (p^2) has put it: "It is without

doubt that the author of this chapter [vi.] teaches us that Elohim here reveals His name Jahveh, *for the first time*, to Moses." We have in these words of Kuenen a fundamental dogma of this criticism, a dogma to which it clings with all the more tenaciousness because it is it that, to the best advantage, shows off, as between the Jahvist and the Elohist, or the Priestly Code, a difference which amounts to a sheer contradiction, and that contradiction establishes the fact that in the Pentateuch we are up against different authors.

Let us take, then, the two passages in the order in which they meet us in the book, and let us begin with chaps. iii. and iv. of Exodus.[1]

Ex. iii. 13, 14: "And Moses said unto God, Behold, when I come to the children of Israel, and shall say unto them, The God of your fathers hath sent me unto you; and they shall say to me, What is his name? What shall I say unto them? And God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM: and he said, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you."

15. "And God said moreover unto Moses, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, Jahveh, the God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, the God of Jacob, hath sent me unto you: this is my name for ever, and this is my memorial unto all generations."

16. "Go and gather the elders of Israel together, and say unto them, Jahveh, the God of your

[1] The translation is taken from *The Centenary Bible.*

fathers, the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob, hath appeared unto me."

And, farther on, as Moses hesitated, and asked a sign by which he might demonstrate to the Israelites the heavenliness of his mission, Jahveh accorded him such a sign : " that they may believe that Jahveh, the God of their fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Iasac, and the God of Jacob, hath appeared unto thee."

Now the sense of this passage is quite clear. In one and the same conversation, Jahveh, with a fourfold repetition, says to Moses that He, Jahveh, has been the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob. And I submit that when their descendants asked Moses, What is the name of the God of our fathers ?—it is absurd—I use the Critics' own term—to hold that the patriarchs had not known what that was. When Jahveh tells us in a manner so positive that He is the God of Abraham, it goes without saying that Abraham knew His name : besides, the patriarch, in what is related of his life, uses the name almost constantly. And if anyone had asked him, Who is thy God ? he would certainly have replied, He is Jahveh. In His reply to Moses, Jahveh, in order to make a powerful impression upon the minds of the children of Israel, states at first, not His name, but the meaning of His name, and He states it after the form of a popular etymology. He deduces it from the verb *to be*, not at all as that verb appears in Hebrew, but as it appears in Aramaic. IHVH, in Aramaic,

means, *He is*, as anyone can see from the Elephantine (p^3) papyri. It is the third person in Aramaic which is put in connection with the first person *I am* in Hebrew. *He is*, in Hebrew, would have had a different form. Jahveh replies to Moses by what His name means. It is as if Moses should say of himself: My name is "the drawn out of the waters," for his name issues from a popular etymology quite like that other.

The passages with which we are dealing, and which I have quoted, show in a formal manner that the name of Jahveh was known to Abraham and to the patriarchs, as Genesis also tell us, and they condemn the interpretation given by the Critics. But in order to maintain their interpretation, the Critics have at hand the means which they habitually employ; they correct the text, with the result that it agrees with their theory. Thus, the first passage (vv. 13, 14) in which Jahveh interprets His name belongs, according to the Critics, to the Elohist, the second (ver. 15) belongs to the redactor, the third (ver. 16) belongs to the Jahvist, and the last isolated words—the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob—are a gloss, belonging to a still later period. In this way this whole passage which holds so admirably together, and from which results a perfectly clear thought, to wit, that Jahveh wishes Moses to teach the Israelites, and to cause the doctrine to enter into their spirits, that He is the God of their fathers—this passage, I say, according to the

Critics, is a composite thing, made up of fragments, which, as they appeared in the original documents, answered to points of view which were very divergent, and in the end the redactor comes and confirms what the Jahvist had said, that is to say, if the Critics be right, confirms the contradictory of what the Elohist had said.

Moses received a positive order from Jahveh, which he executed. He quitted Jethro, his father-in-law, in order to return to Egypt. He met on the way Aaron, whom Jahveh had instructed, in the sense that he should go and meet him. Aaron surely knew Jahveh at that time. Moses related to him all the words wherewith Jahveh had charged him. The two brothers assembled the elders of Israel. Aaron rehearsed all the words that Jahveh had spoken to Moses, of which the sum was this: Jahveh, the God of your fathers, has sent me to you. It is possible that name, Jahveh, was new to some in Israel. We know little of the nature of their worship during their long sojourn in Egypt. Up to what point would they have conserved the tradition, the memory of the covenant with Jahveh, and His promises, if there was no one there to recall those things to their memory? Nevertheless, at the hearing of that which had been said to Moses, the Israelites believed. When they understood that Jahveh had visited them, and that He had looked upon their affliction, they bowed their heads and worshipped.

Thus the Israelites knew thoroughly well that

it was Jahveh Who had visited them, and Who had regarded their misery. Immediately after this meeting with the elders, Moses and Aaron (or, according to certain Critics, Moses alone) presented themselves before Pharaoh, and said to him: "Thus saith Jahveh, the God of Israel, Let My people go." Thus we see that it was in the name of Jahveh, and by His order, that the two brothers appeared before Pharaoh; and Pharaoh replied as any Egyptian would have done: "Who is Jahveh, that I should hearken unto His voice to let Israel go? I know not Jahveh, and, moreover, I will not let Israel go" (Ex. v. 2). So Moses explains to him that it is the God of the Hebrews Who has charged him with this message.

Moses did not succeed in that first attempt, nor had the interview any other result than that of aggravating still worse the sufferings of the children of Israel; and naturally the overseers of the people were indignant against Moses and against Aaron: "Jahveh," said they, "look upon you and judge, because ye have made our name to be abhorred in the eyes of Pharaoh, and in the eyes of his servants." So Moses returned to Jahveh, and asked Him why He had charged him with a mission that was destined to have such grievous consequences. Jahveh replied to Moses: "Now shalt thou see what I will do to Pharaoh." And He added: "I am Jahveh, and I appeared (lit., I have been seen, ὤφθην, I manifested Myself)

to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob as El Shaddai (God Almighty), but I did not make My name Jahveh known to them (οὐκ ἐδήλωσα). And I have also established My covenant with them to give them the land of Canaan" (Ex. vi. 2–4).

In these last words we have the passage upon which the Critics base their affirmation. Without any doubt, according to Kuenen, it is the first time that Jahveh reveals His name to the Israelites. We have, of course, just seen that the Israelites did believe that Jahveh had visited the people, also, that their overseers took Jahveh to witness that the intervention of Moses had been hurtful to them. But that construction, so we are told, does not take sufficient account of the circumstance that those passages were from the Jahvist, while here we are face to face with the Priestly Code, the post-exilian record, which at one time was known as the first Elohist, and that to its testimony we must pin our faith rather than to that of the Jahvist.

According to the Critics, the *name* of Jahveh means His proper name, the Tetragrammaton, and they will not allow us interpret that name after any other fashion. Let us then ascertain how the word is employed in passages that are anterior to Ex. vi.

We are, to begin with, told that in the time of Enosh, men began to call upon the name of Jahveh (Gen. iv. 26). That means, if the Higher Critics are right, that men then began to call upon the proper name of Jahveh, the Tetragrammaton.

After Abraham built an altar (Gen. xii. 7) to Jahveh, Who appeared unto him (ὀφθέντι), he called upon the proper name of Jahveh; and, again (Gen. xxi. 33), after he had planted a tamarisk tree in Beer-sheba, he called upon the proper name of Jahveh. Similarly, Isaac (Gen. xxvi. 25), after he had built an altar, called upon the proper name Jahveh, the Tetragrammaton. And then, if we go on applying the critical interpretation to other passages, we land ourselves in absurdities: "We shall boast in the name of Jahveh our God," does not, properly understood, surely mean that we shall boast of the fact that the proper name of our God is the Tetragrammaton. On the contrary, as we read many passages where mention is made of the name of God, we see that the name means the Person with all that characterises that Person. To call upon the name of God is to call upon God Himself, apprehending Him as He makes Himself known to us, as indeed good common sense should teach us.

It would certainly be strange if, in order to reassure the Israelites, and to encourage them to reckon upon Him in the trying circumstances in which they found themselves, God should say to them: "You will henceforth call Me by a new name, that of Jahveh." But it was not that at all that God gave them then to understand by what He said to them. He did not at all say to them: "I did not make My proper name Jahveh

known to your fathers," an idea that would have been expressed in Hebrew by using the verb נגד (*nagad*) (Gen. xxxii. 30; Judg. xiii. 6). Neither did He say to them: "You shall call My name Jahveh," or "My name will be Jahveh,"—if, that is, as interpreters we are guided by the usual formula, when it is a question of giving a name, or of changing a name (see Gen. xvii. 5, 15, xxii. 14, xxxv. 10, 15, 18, xli. 45, etc.).

He, to begin with, told them what His name is: "אני יהוה," I am Jahveh. ["אני יהוה," I am Jahveh, says Isaiah (xlii. 8), "that is My name, and I will not give My glory to any other."] And He continues thus (Ex. vi. 2 f.): "I appeared (lit., I have been seen, ὤφθην) unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, as El Shaddai, but by My name Jahveh I was not made known to them, and yet I established My covenant with them to give them the land of Canaan." The proper name is not what is revelatory, or makes evident, or strikes the eye. A man makes known what he is by his acts, and not by the name he bears. "I manifested Myself as El Shaddai," does not mean "under that name." We translate "Shaddai" by "Almighty," according to the sense which that term has everywhere else beyond the Pentateuch. The compound expression El Shaddai was no longer undertsood in the era of the Prophets. It is found six times in Genesis, and once in Exodus, in the passage with which we are now occupied. In no case in the Pentateuch

does the LXX render Shaddai by Almighty (παντοκράτωρ); the LXX always renders this term in the Pentateuch by a possessive pronoun, "*my* God" or "*their* God." Twice does Balaam use the term Shaddai without El, and in these cases the LXX renders by θεοῦ (Num. xxiv. 4, 16). Once El Shaddai appears in Ezekiel (x. 5), where the LXX simply transcribes the name θεοῦ σαδδαί, a circumstance that puts it beyond doubt that the Seventy did not really understand the meaning of the term.

It is clear that we have in the expression El Shaddai another instance of a popular etymology. The expression, in the original cuneiform, must have been a term indicating possession, something which corresponded with the expression made use of by the LXX, θεὸς αὐτῶν, their own God, and it sounded somewhat like the Hebrew word Shaddai (All-sufficient), and with Shaddai it became assimilated. The proof of that is that in Ezekiel i. 24, where the term Shaddai is found all alone, it is translated by ἱκανός (sufficient), and so also once in Ruth and twice in Job. This last book makes frequent use of the word *Shaddai*, where it is found some forty times. The single word is generally translated, so far as Job is concerned, in the LXX by παντοκράτωρ, although more than once by κύριος.

If the Critics are right, of the six times in which this ancient compound term El Shaddai occurs in Genesis, four instances are due to the Priestly

Code and one to the redactor—that is to say, five out of six times is this most ancient term found in the most recent documents.

"I revealed Myself to the fathers as their own God," says Jahveh (keeping to the LXX version); but I did not make known to them that I am Jahveh. And yet I made a covenant with them. I said to Abraham, I am Jahveh that brought thee forth out of Ur of the Chaldees, in order to give thee this land; but I did not make known to him what this expression, I am Jahveh, means, for My promise was not yet fulfilled, and I have not even yet manifested to the Israelites, by my acts, that I am Jahveh. One needs only to read the remainder of Exodus in order to perceive how Jahveh proceeded to make them understand the significance of the expression, "I am Jahveh." It amounts to saying: "This is why I say unto the children of Israel, I am Jahveh; just because I will bring you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians, and I will rid you of their bondage . . . and I will take you to Me for a people, and I will be to you a God; *and ye shall know that I am Jahveh*, your God, Who bringeth you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians; and I will bring you into the land which I sware to give to Abraham. . . . I am Jahveh." Thus the Israelites should know Jahveh, not at all by His saying to them: My proper Name is Jahveh, the Tetragrammaton, but by His acts. I am Jahveh, means: I am the God that manifests Himself, that

maketh Himself known by His acts, of which some are acts of judgement and others acts of mercy.

We have here the first of a number of passages in which Jahveh shows us how He makes Himself known as Jahveh to men, what the name of Jahveh means, and what mean these, so oft-repeated, words, "*I am Jahveh.*" It is first of all Pharaoh and the Egyptians who shall know (or have experience) of it. The Hebrew word ידע, *yada*, has ever this force. They are about to experience what Jeremiah (xvi. 21) described by these words: "I will cause them to know My hand and My might, and they shall know that My name is Jahveh." Similarly, "The Egyptians shall know that I am Jahveh when I stretch out My hand upon Egypt" (Ex. vii. 5): "Thus saith Jahveh (to Pharaoh), In this thou shalt know that I am Jahveh; behold, I will smite with My hand upon the waters which are in the river . . ." (vii. 17). Afterwards, when Jahveh gives orders to the Israelites to encamp by the Red Sea, He adds: "And I will get Me honour upon Pharaoh, and upon all his host; and the Egyptians shall know that I am Jahveh" (xiv. 4). And farther on He says: "The Egyptians shall know that I am Jahveh, when I have gotten Me honour upon Pharaoh, upon his chariots, and upon his horsemen" (xiv. 18).

But all the visitations of Jahveh were not visitations of judgements, or for punishment. He makes Himself known also by His mercy:

"I am Jahveh that healeth thee" (xv. 26). "At even ye shall eat flesh, and in the morning ye shall be filled with bread: and ye shall know that I am Jahveh your God" (xvi. 12). It would take too long a time to cite here all the passages in which God is said to make men experience or know that He is Jahveh, for there is only one expression, always identical in meaning, which is used in this connection. In Ezekiel alone we are told more than thirty times how "they shall know that I am Jahveh." How can we accept the interpretation put by the Critics on the expression in question, in such passages as these: "I will give them a heart to know Me, that I am Jahveh"? (Jer. xxiv. 7). "And I will send a fire on Magog . . . and they shall know that I am Jahveh. And My holy name will I make known in the midst of My people Israel; neither will I suffer My holy name to be profaned any more: and the nations shall know that I am Jahveh, the Holy One of Israel" (Ezek. xxxix. 6). "Not for your sakes do I this, O house of Israel, but for My holy name, which ye have profaned among the nations, whither ye went. And I will sanctify My great name, which hath been profaned among the nations, which ye have profaned in the midst of them. And the nations shall know that I am Jahveh, saith the Lord Jahveh, when I shall be sanctified in you before their eyes" (Ezek. xxxvi. 22, 23). Thus to sanctify Jahveh, or to sanctify His name, are equipollent expressions; and what results from

sanctifying His name is, that "the nations shall know that I am Jahveh."

Sometimes this knowledge is represented as the fruit of a return to God: "And the slain shall fall in the midst of you, and ye shall know that I am Jahveh. Yet will I leave a remnant, in that ye shall have some that escape the sword among the nations, when ye shall be scattered through the countries. . . . And they shall loath themselves in their own sight for the evils which they have committed in all their abominations. And they shall know that I am Jahveh, (and) that I have not said in vain that I would do this evil unto them" (Ezek. vi. 7–10).

If very often this knowledge is the result of chastisements and punishments inflicted on individuals or nations, at other times Jahveh makes this knowledge to spring up as the fruit of His goodness and mercy. The prophet addressed himself to Israelites, of whom no one will say that they did not know the vocable Jahveh, as follows: "I will cause you to be inhabited after your former estate, and will do better unto you than at your beginnings; and ye shall know that I am Jahveh" (Ezek. xxxvi. 11). It is needless to say more in this regard. The name of Jahveh is Jahveh Himself. To be called, is to be; as the following passage, and it is but one of a multitude, clearly shows: "Thou shalt worship no other gods; for Jahveh is called the Jealous God (lit., His name is Jealous), and He is a jealous God" (Ex.

xxxiv. 14). We conclude, therefore, that to say that God is called, and that God is, are strictly equipollent expressions.

I return to the passage in Exodus : " Now shalt thou see what I will do to Pharaoh. . . . I am Jahveh : and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob as God Shaddai, but by My name Jahveh I was not made known to them." The Hebrew is : *My name Jahveh, I have not been known* (*cognitus sum*, Buxtorf)." There is no preposition, *under*, *by*, or any other, before " My name Jahveh." In other words : " They have not known that I am Jahveh, and nevertheless I have established a covenant with them." Moses, in fact, says to them : " I am Jahveh, and I will deliver you from your bondage ; and ye shall know that I am Jahveh your God." How shall they know Him ? Not at all because Moses announces to them a name consisting of four letters, but because Jahveh will show Himself to be Jahveh by His visitations in their favour, and by fulfilling His promises.

Ezekiel recalls for us that scene in Egypt, and what Jahveh then said to the Israelites. At chap. xx. 5 f., we read : " Thus saith the Lord Jahveh : In the day when I chose Israel, and sware unto the seed of the house of Jacob, and made Myself known unto them in the land of Egypt, when I sware unto them, saying, I am Jahveh your God ; in that day I sware unto them to bring them forth out of the land of Egypt into a land that I

had searched out for them." That is exactly what Ex. vi. means: "I am Jahveh who bringeth you out of Egypt; and ye shall know (by this) that I am Jahveh."

M. Humbert finds my exposition of these words, "I am Jahveh," too artificial. The exposition is not mine. I think I have cited a sufficient number of passages to show what the expression, "Ye shall know that I am Jahveh," means, and I am surprised that M. Humbert asserts that I am not true to the principle of the method that prescribes our taking the texts just as they have been written. I submit that not only is my interpretation absolutely conformed to the text, but that it is the logical development of what goes before. Jahveh made Himself known to Abraham by one of His acts, which terminated upon Abraham: "I am Jahveh who brought thee out of Ur of the Chaldees, so as to give thee this land in possession." That promise, however, had not been fully realised by Abraham personally, nor was it so realised even at the time when the Israelites were still enduring persecution in Egypt. But then, by the mouth of Moses, Jahveh goes on to say to the Israelites: "I am Jahveh, I entered into covenant with your fathers, and I am about to deliver you and to bring you into the land which I promised them as an inheritance; and ye shall know that I am Jahveh." Later on, the Decalogue will begin with these words, so altogether reminiscent of those that Abraham had listened to: "I am

Jahveh thy God, that brought thee forth out of the land of Egypt."

Jahveh means the God who manifests Himself by His acts. That interpretation issues from a large number of Old Testament passages. It conforms to what one reads in every book of the Old Testament, and to the whole history of Israel. As to the interpretation of the Critics, "I did not make the four letters of the Tetragrammaton known," it is merely an interpretation of grammarians, or of philologists, which, in the passage under consideration, is lacking in sense, and an interpretation against which, first the French version of Olivétan, and afterwards Astruc protested: "This passage shows that God had not to the full extent and meaning of this name made Himself known to the patriarchs, while on the contrary He did do so to Moses" (P. 30, 7).

The Critics will not renounce their own interpretation, because, in fact, they find it indispensable. Understood as they claim it should be, "the two passages in Exodus are a valuable testimony to a difference in points of view, and consequently to a plurality of sources in the Pentateuch." It is one of the foundations of their system.

We have there an example of the method of the Higher Criticism, and of the fundamental difference which distinguishes it from a method which starts from principles which I do not hesitate to call the principles of a sane criticism. We have before us

texts which at their commencement tell us that Jahveh is the God of mankind, and that from the first He was invoked under that name; then, that He is the God of Abraham, to whom Jahveh made known His name, and upon Whom Abraham called, Who also made a covenant with the patriarch and with his posterity; the same Who also is the God of Isaac and of Jacob. Later on, Jahveh says to Moses, that He revealed Himself to the fathers after an incomplete manner, but that He is about to manifest that He is Jahveh by His judgements which are to terminate upon Pharaoh, and by His goodness and His faithfulness to His promises in respect of the children of Israel. And still later the prophets tell us repeatedly that Jahveh makes Himself known in action, and that it is by His acts that the people shall know that He is Jahveh.

We, in keeping with our principle, accept what the text says. The author, to whom we owe the text, gives an account which unfolds itself in the most natural manner without any shock whatsoever, and where everything develops according to a logical order. He tells us, to begin with, how Jahveh made Himself known to Abraham and to his family. To the Israelites He makes known even the extent and meaning of His name. They will know Him, not at all by the four letters of His name, but by all that He is about to perform. This will be a considerable step in the progress of revelation. It will, moreover, be the renewal

with the people of Israel of the covenant into which God had already entered with Abraham. We see no reason at all for disputing anything whatever in all this narrative, which is so simple, and which holds so well together, and the interpretation we give the passage in Exodus is in perfect harmony with what the words that follow tell us.

Let us now hear the Critics. We may nowadays regard it as with them a settled point, that among the four elements which go to make up the Pentateuch, there is one author who wrote in the ninth century B.C., who is called the Jahvist, because that from his first pages he makes use of the name of Jahveh. Let us consider then what he tells us: Adam's grandson, according to this Jahvist writer, called upon the name of Jahveh. Jahveh is ever with him the God of Abraham, Who reveals Himself to him by His name, Who makes a covenant with him, and gives him promises which are transmitted to his posterity. It is impossible on a reading of what the Jahvist says not to conclude that the covenant of Jahveh with Abraham is the corner-stone of the history of Israel. Jahveh becomes the national God of Israel because that, to begin with, He was the God of Israel's first father, Abraham, in whose person Israel was elected as the people of God.

But, lo! at an epoch posterior to the Exile, somewhere about the fifth century B.C., an author, or a school, the Priestly Code, emerges to inform

us that anything of that kind could not have been, for the simple reason that the proper name Jahveh, a word of four letters, was not known to the Israelites until the epoch of the Exodus from Egypt. On this account, men of the ante-diluvian period could not have called upon the name of Jahveh: Abraham never heard these words: "I am Jahveh that brought thee out of Ur." Abraham never said: "Lord Jahveh." Most emphatically he never did enter into that covenant with Jahveh, according to which the possession of Canaan was guaranteed to his posterity. In a word, Jahveh was not the God of Abraham, nor of Isaac, nor yet of Jacob—Jacob to whom it never was said: "I am Jahveh, the God of Abraham thy father, and the God of Isaac." That phrase which recurs so frequently, "Jahveh, the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob," is merely an error. The result of this is, that there is between two of the fundamental documents of Genesis, the Jahvist and the Priestly Code, an absolute contradiction, in comparison with which the difficulties which the critics so insistently flourish before the eyes of the defenders of what is read in the text, are but trifles. According to the Critics' interpretation, the second document gives the lie direct to all that goes before. It makes the name of Jahveh disappear from the whole of Genesis. One can scarcely conceive an opposition that is more radical, or that changes more completely one's way of looking

upon the text. There is no getting away from that. Was Jahveh known to Abraham or was He not? One of the texts says that He was. The other, according to you, denies it. You make it both, Yes, and, No. But in your sight a contradiction so flagrant is not a contradiction at all, it is only a difference in point of view.

And here we have yet another example which shows that the critical method is just such as I described it on an earlier page. In the 6th chapter of Exodus, the Critics put upon the phrase "to know the name of Jahveh" an interpretation which may not violate grammar, but which is in absolute contrast to all that goes before. To know the name of Jahveh does not mean anything else, they say, than to know the proper name Jahveh, the Tetragrammaton, and the revelation thereof was made only at the time of the Exodus. This interpretation is held to be indisputable, it is the infallible criterion according to which we must judge the entire text. If the text is not conformed to this interpretation, if nearly the whole of Genesis declares itself in a sense contrary to that interpretation of it, it just means that Genesis, as we have it, is based on false presuppositions; it is because Genesis, as we have it, rests on an error which dominates the whole book from the second chapter onwards. The conclusion is, that the writer of the life of Abraham cannot have been one and the same

with the writer to whom we owe what we know of the Exodus from Egypt. Therein we are supposed to have " a valuable testimony to a diversity of authors."

We are not allowed to entertain the thought that possibly the passage in Exodus could be otherwise construed—construed so as to show its harmony with what goes before and with what comes after. It is not the text which must conduct us to our interpretation, it is the interpretation which the Critics give to the passage in question that gives law to the text as to what it must mean, and which, for criticism, disengages the true from the false. That is what Critics call sound historical criticism. For me it is only a system which overthrows logical order in the study of ancient documents, for it is based upon the preconceived idea that not only is the Pentateuch not by Moses, but that it is due to authors who were born in countries and lived at periods that were far apart. In order to support that idea, the Critics examine the text with minute care, they heap up all the little facts which might be construed in their sense; they do not mind it much if, on their construction, two of their authors contradict one another on a fundamental point, and some Critics go the length of forbidding myself to call attention to Egyptian passages, in the Pentateuch, which reveal the hand of Moses. " It is," they say, " unmethodical to use these isolated passages so as to bring suspicion on a

grand conviction, on the new theory concerning the Pentateuch." [1]

M. Humbert will permit me to place over against his method another and different method which is ours, the method of a whole school which is nowadays continually gaining new strength. Genesis teaches me that from the Creation man had Jahveh as God, that it was He Who made choice of Abraham and entered into covenant with him and with his family, and promised him to give the land to his posterity. I see no reason why we should not accept that account just as it is, and in all its simplicity. Several centuries after the death of Joseph, after the family of Jacob had become a great nation, to a people whose remembrance of Jahveh, in the course of a long period of prosperity, was probably somewhat effaced, Jahveh, I say, when treating of bringing this people into Canaan, through the instrumentality of Moses, said to the children of Israel: "I appeared to your fathers as their God, but I did not give them to experience what My name means: I am Jahveh. I am about to make that known to you by My acts; to begin with, in what directly concerns you, by fulfilling my promise, and again, relatively to Pharaoh, whom I shall cause to feel My power. You shall know that I am Jahveh by My acts, thus will I manifest Myself to you in a manner that I had not done to your fathers." All that links perfectly with what

[1] Koenig, *The Expositor*, Sept. 1914.

went before, and is the natural sequel and development thereof. And one can see that ever afterwards, whenever one reads, "they, or ye, shall know that I am Jahveh," the meaning is, that Jahveh makes Himself known by His judgements or by His mercies. From Genesis to the 6th chapter of Exodus there is no contradiction; on the contrary, there is that unity of thought inspiring Genesis, as well as the books which follow, which is the mark of unity of authorship.

A Bevy of other Writers.

Before closing what I have to say on the different documents which the Critics say are discoverable in the Pentateuch, I should like to say a word concerning a bevy of authors that play a very important rôle in the critical theory, although, as a rule, the Critics say extremely little about them. They correspond to what in mechanics would be called mounters—that is to say, the men whose business it is to bring together all the pieces that are necessary in order to make of many parts one whole. These redactors—for that in the present connection is the technical term—must have been many in number. Who were they? When did they live? How were they chosen to do this work? Take, for example, the Jahvist. The Centenary Bible, speaking of the 2nd chapter of Genesis alone, acknowledges three Jahvists which it distinctly designates; but after the chapter deal-

ing with the Flood, only one is recognised, who, of course, as such needs no graduating number; there is only the Jahvist. Which of the three absorbed the other two? Or is there a fourth that was placed over them? Or if, as some Critics say, J stands for a composite work, the work of a school, how is one to distinguish the successive strata out of which has been formed the text as we see it under our eyes? Furthermore, difficulties, quite as great as those connected with the Jahvist, meet us as we try to investigate the work of the Elohist, and of the Priestly Code, and the editors of them. Owing to the impossibility of finding an answer to the questions which their method gives occasion to, the Critics, as a rule, reduce the redactors that have worked on the Pentateuch to two. Astruc says clearly that from the beginning of the 2nd chapter of Exodus, Moses is the author, and that henceforth as author he is his own authority, and that henceforth there is not the difference due to certain passages being Elohistic and others Jahvistic, since henceforth there is only the one author. For him there was no difficulty on this score. But the case is otherwise with those who maintain a plurality of authors. There are certain books, like Numbers, where it is impossible to distinguish J from E. The only way to get over the embarrassment is to create a redactor JE, who fuses the two authors into one. JE must have been earlier than Deuteronomy,

and so earlier than 621 B.C. Later the Deuteronomist, D, a new document, was added to the earlier JE, and that resulted in JED; and, finally, when the Priestly Code, P, the latest document, appeared, that led to the final fusion JEDP, which is our present Pentateuch (Gautier) (*q*).

The Critics are far from being in agreement on the diverse phases of this process of editing, and on the manner in which the documents were amalgamated. At the same time, there is general agreement about the existence at one time of a document JE. But one would expect that his hand would be recognised only after J and E are in accord, after there is no longer occasion to distinguish between Jahveh and Elohim. But, contrary to what one would think, passages are attributed to JE, even in Genesis, where the name of God does not appear in any form—passages which might belong to the one as easily as to the other, as, in that which relates to the death of Rachel (xxxv. 16), in that concerning the descendants of Esau (xxxvi. 38), and in several passages belonging to the history of Joseph (xxxvii. 2, 12, 23). But what is more strange: the Critics ascribe to JE the beginning of chap. xv. One would have thought that, with Astruc, the Critics would have frankly ascribed this passage to the Jahvist. It reads: "After these things, the word of Jahveh came unto Abram, I am thy shield, and thy exceeding great reward. And Abram said,

O Lord, Jahveh. . . ." The Centenary Bible tells us why this passage is regarded as a fusion of J and E. "Here," it says, "appear for the first time traces of the source E. These expressions, *after these things; in a vision*, recall his manner of relating events." "We may also," says the same authority, "attribute to E the following words: '*Fear not, Abram, I am thy shield*'—words that are the expression of an idea that is totally different from that of the last part of the divine declaration." Of course the author of that note, who looks upon chap. xiv. as non-existent when chap. xv. was written, could not possibly appreciate the reason why the divine declaration is in these terms, for he does not recognise that the declaration is in close connection with the narrative of chap. xiv. I seriously ask: Is it possible to cite a profane text which Critics treat after that manner?

It is needless to say much on the work of the final redactor, of whom I have written elsewhere.[1] But, to put it succinctly, let it be said that one can see that this author not only amalgamates into one narrative fragments of diverse documents, but that he employs and develops fragments with a view to finishing up scenes or narratives after his own fashion which result in a representation of the case that has nothing to answer to it

[1] *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, 1917: Les deux noms de Dieu dans la Genèse, p. 10.

in any of the documents which he retraces. One might point out several passages of that kind within the book of Genesis, as, the visit of Joseph to his dying father (xlviii.), and others, or, even the 1st chapter of Exodus. We have said that the Higher Criticism is merely a work of destruction. Our readers may now pass judgement on the character of the foundations upon which Critics claim to have reared up those discoveries of which the future, they say, is assured, and which, like a powerful river, will sweep before it all that would have the audacity of placing itself in its way.

Note

Since writing those pages, I have made the acquaintance of an interesting article by M. G. Contenau (*r*), " On the force of the Name among the Babylonians " (*Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, 1920, Mai–Juin, p. 316). The author commences by citing the opening words of a Babylonian poem, of which he says this : " The first lines of the Babylonian poem, devoted to the creation of the world, give an exposition of a fundamental point of the Babylonian Philosophy—a thing exists only as it has a name. Instead of saying ' whatsoever may exist,' the Assyrio-Babylonians use the expression ' all that has a name.' ' The name of a person,' says Renan, ' is the person him-

self.' By consequence, *Shem* (name) 'becomes an equivalent of Jahveh, especially among the Samaritans.'"

Thus, "My name is Jahveh" reduces to "I am Jahveh."

CHAPTER III

THE LANGUAGE OF MOSES: ARAMAIC: HEBREW (*s*)

The Historical Method

Its Second Principle.

LET us now fix our attention on the second principle of our method: which is, that we must replace the texts with which we are dealing within the times in which the author lived, in the situation with which he was actually surrounded, with the manners and habits thereof. And here we shall come up against the "crushing" facts by the help of which M. Humbert easily gets the better of my "fragile hypotheses."

Language and Script.—And to begin with, there is the question of the language. In what language did Moses write, and was the manner of his writing in keeping with the habits of the time in which he lived?

A careful examination into the circumstances of the time, circumstances with which the fine discoveries of the last twenty years within the whole of Western Asia, including Mesopotamia, Syria, Palestine, and other places, have made us acquainted, have led me with others to the conclusion that the

works of Moses could have been reduced to writing only in the cuneiform Babylonian or Accadian. That, I am told, is a very weak hypothesis, which is easily overthrown in the light of the facts of the case. M. Humbert reproaches me for having little respect for arguments that bear the hall-mark of universities and academies—notwithstanding their scholarly character—and for sure laws which philology proclaims. It is true that I much prefer, and I am not ashamed to say it, to see what passes before one's eyes in our own time, to hear what is even now spoken, to consider, for instance, with attention the conditions under which the people of the Orient are now living, to consult missionaries settled in the midst of peoples of primitive habits, and to draw from these my conclusions, rather than submit to the decrees of closet scholars, who, with every assurance, certify that it must be as they affirm, *es muss so sein.* The living, it is, as I understand things, that explain the dead. For, much of what was found with generations that are dead and gone still makes up the experience of the generation that is now living.

This method of investigation has led me to call attention to a fact, which at the same time is quite patent, to wit, that the old philology started from the idea—an idea which M. Humbert still proceeds upon—that within their own definite boundaries every people had their own government, their own habits, their own language—a language which was

one and the same for that whole country; and that, in every case, it was a literary language, with which went its own alphabet. I have no hesitation in saying that that idea is radically wrong. Every people, at least where they have not been moulded by the influence of a thorough education, and by an advanced civilisation directly due to the schools, have two different languages, or rather they have only one language, that is properly their own, the vernacular idiom which serves their purpose in their ordinary life, which even within one country may appear under distinctly different forms, which nowadays is described as *patois* or, in the Swiss-German, "Dialekt." The written language, which often reaches a province from without, may extend its dominion over a great number of dialects. It is clear that, corresponding to the several countries or provinces over which it is being used, the written language will bear traces more or less pronounced of the vernacular speeches.

Take, for example, the German language. From Königsberg to Fribourg in Switzerland, or even to Gratz—what a large extent of country the Saxon dialect of Luther has succeeded in making its own! And how many dialects are there within that region which, albeit all of them are reckoned as German, differ much one from another! Without going beyond my own country, the speech of the labourer at Saint Gall is not the same as that of the shepherd of the Bernese Oberland, and this

latter would, for a certainty, not be understood by a peasant of Brandeburg. And for all that, in the case of one as of the other, the literary language is the same, their books are all in German : if they are Protestants, their Bible is without variation one and the same, the preaching is in German—although in the preaching one often hears expressions that belong to the local speech, as indeed one also does in the deliberations of the councils—more so possibly than in the newspapers.

The case, in this connection, is not different in what regards the French language. The dialect of the Isle of France became the French of the Academy, what is called good French, for which the French have so great regard that the term *patois*, which ought to mean simply the spoken dialect, is used in a scornful way, as meaning the language of the uneducated. I often find my opponents indignant, because I claim that the Old Testament, as we know it, is in *Jehudith*, the *patois* of Jerusalem. But, for all that, the situation which I have supposed, was on all fours with what we find to have been true of Egypt. In Egypt, the Holy Scriptures were rendered, not at all into one dominating literary language, but into four *patois*, spoken in different parts of the country, each one of which dialects became, through this, a literary language. The Coptic language is not a single language. The term embraces four dialects of the people, all written by means of a new alphabet.

What we to-day find to be true in respect of German, of French, as of Italian also, and of English, held good, in the same identical sense, for the languages of antiquity. If there is one certain fact that stands well established by the discoveries of the last thirty years, it is, that throughout the whole of Western Asia, from the Isles of the Gulf of Persia and Susa up to the Black Sea—embracing Palestine—the literary language of the Semitic peoples was the Cuneiform Babylonian, the Accadian. That state of things began possibly with the period in which Sargon, king of Accad (2650 B.C.), conquered the West—at least as far as Cyprus—and gave to that wide region one literary language. That state of things continued up to the time that Aramaic supplanted the Cuneiform, about the beginning of the ninth century B.C.

CUNEIFORM BABYLONIAN.—The truth of that we have learned from the thousands of cuneiform tablets which have been preserved in those several countries. I am not now speaking of the large libraries of Nippur and of Kouyunjik in Mesopotamia. So far as these latter places are concerned, there was no occasion to ask what was the language in which the learned wrote. But tablets have been discovered in other places, and primarily at Tel el-Amarna (*t*), which prove that Accadian was the literary language of the land of Canaan; that the people of Tyre and of Sidon, as well as of Jerusalem, of Ascalon, of

Lachish, of Gebel, of Berat, of Gezer, together with those of Alasia (Cyprus), were wont to write to The Pharaoh in the language of the kings of Mesopotamia.

But it is from the excavations carried on at Boghaz Keui by Dr. Winckler (t^1)—excavations that were interrupted first by the war and then by the death of Dr. Winckler—that the richest harvest of information in this connection has come to us. Dr. Winckler was struck, to begin with, with the striking resemblance that the tablets discovered at Boghaz Keui bore to those of Tel el-Amarna. Boghaz Keui was the capital of the Hethians or Hittites, a people of Asia Minor. He discovered that the great king of the Chetti, and other kings of Asia Minor, in their international communications made use of cuneiform, and that, in the culture of the Hittites, the Babylonian Cuneiform had played as important a rôle as it did in Palestine and in Syria. Not all these tablets were written in the Babylonian language. A large number of them are in the language of the Hittites, but they are written in the cuneiform script, and there are still other non-Semitic languages, which all of them, nevertheless, make use of the cuneiform script. In a word, all this correspondence with the kings of Mesopotamia, or with Palestine, with the Amurri or with the Kharri, as well as with Egypt—the remark holds good of the treaty of Rameses II. with the Hittites, a treaty with which heretofore, scholars were

acquainted only in its Egyptian version—all this correspondence, I say, is written in Babylonian cuneiform.

If now we pass on to what we may call the cradle of that language, Mesopotamia, we count its tablets of every kind, some of them earlier than, and others of them later than, Moses, by the thousands. Large libraries like that of Nippur, and that of Kouyunjik, contain an immense collection of documents dealing with all branches of knowledge, and of science, as understood by the wise men of that period (Rassam). There are, in those libraries, historical records, chronological lists, astronomical observations, tables of measure, " and there are, above all, hundreds of hymns and psalms, prayers and oracles, mythological texts, and incantations, that in poetical expression, and depth of religious feeling, are not inferior to the best Hebrew poetry." [1] Add to that a quantity of official documents. In the library of Nippur there have been discovered documents that date from the third millennium, from the first dynasty of Babylon down to the year 400 B.C. There, and at Tello, too, there have been discovered tablets whose provenance was Ur of the Chaldees, the fatherland of Abraham. " These documents, from the nature of their clay and the beauty of their writing, are among the finest specimens yet discovered in Babylonia." [2] They

[1] Hilprecht's *Explorations in Bible Lands*, p. 122.
[2] King's *Sumer and Akkad*, p. 293.

are written in Sumerian, the oldest language of Mesopotamia.

We find, then, the cuneiform Babylonian as the only form of literary Semitic, written from the Isles of the Gulf of Persia, passing through Susa—where we meet with the Code of Hammurapi (t^2)—and taking in the whole of Mesopotamia, of Palestine, and a large part of Asia Minor. We do not, in all that region, find any other form of a written Semitic language. I emphasise the word Semitic, because the cuneiform script was made use of for writing other languages, even the Aryan. It is certain that in that vast extent of territory, there were hundreds of spoken dialects that must have left traces of themselves in the written tablets. Why have such traces been noticed only in the tablets found in Tel el-Amarna? Because that Palestine is the only region whose spoken language we know. What know we of the *patois* of Lachish, of Nippur, or even of Babylon, or of all the localities whence come to us these tablets? Little or nothing.

According to M. Humbert and other philologists, the presence of those glosses (t^2) in the Tel el-Amarna tablets, glosses which Winckler describes as Phœnician, proves that there did at that period exist another language, Hebrew in the strict sense, which must have been used in committing to writing the sacred Scriptures. I invite the defenders of that view to come and inspect a form of literature which Geneva is singular in possessing.

I refer to hundreds of thousands of letters, received by the Agency for Prisoners of War. They will there see how the literary language, even of our own time, in spite of obligatory education in schools, is enamelled with expressions, or with local forms, of every description. If these scholars are right, this proves that French or German cannot have been the literary language of the countries whence these letters came. What is witnessed in the Tel el-Amarna tablets is the daily experience of our time. Evidently it is in letters that expressions drawn from the vernacular of a country are for most part found, but we see them also in many another situation, in notary deeds, in newspapers. That sort of thing may be met with in any of the cantons of Switzerland. Let us take, for an example, the canton of Neuchâtel. In the sense of the Critics, when one of its pastors, Ostervald, translated the Bible into French, he made use of a language that was not the literary language of the country. There existed in the country another literary language than that in which the sacred writings were written. That is how the ideas of the Critics respecting the inhabitants of the Palestine in the days of the Tel el-Amarna tablets read, when rendered into modern speech.

But to return to the subject of the Tel el-Amarna tablets: the Canaanitish scribes wrote to the King of Egypt in a language that was not Pharaoh's own, but which he must of necessity use in his correspondence with all the princes,

whether they were of Macedonia or of Syria, or of the kingdom of the Hittites—yea, in carrying on this correspondence, as the texts tell us, Pharaoh had need of a targumanu, a dragoman. And the curious thing is, if M. Humbert is right, that the Canaanitish scribes, who are supposed not to have been too expert in that literary language, so as to make themselves better understood by the King of Egypt, mixed their phrases with words drawn from the local dialect; although these were bound to be still more unintelligible to the King. But I find it difficult to admit this critical explanation of the glosses present in the Tel el-Amarna tablets.

To sum up, if we place Moses at the period in which he must have lived, we find that he can only have written his books in the cuneiform Babylonian or Accadian, and I rest that "fragile hypothesis" on an immense literature, that of Western Asia, of which there remain thousands of tablets to this day. From a period which goes up to at least the third millennium B.C., and down to 1000 B.C., the literary language of the Semitic peoples, succeeding as it did to the Sumerian, whose alphabet it borrowed, was, in Western Asia, the cuneiform Babylonian, and still later it was the Assyrian, which is only a slight modification of Babylonian, a form which endured down to the time of Nebuchadnezzar. That does not mean that in the course of centuries there had not been developed other languages and alphabets, which were being made use of simultaneously with the cuneiform. Thus,

to speak of what is later than the ninth century, the Aramaic language, which appears to be evolved from the cuneiform, comes to light in the eighth century in countries where people had, before then, always witnessed the cuneiform; and it was employed simultaneously with Assyrian, exactly parallel to the use of the demotic with the hieratic in Egypt. And in the same period there emerged the Canaanite script (t^4), whose provenance is Phœnicia, or, according to the latest researches, it came either from Crete or from Asia Minor. In the case of the Aramaic script, we have an entire Judaic literature, while in the case of the Canaanite script, we have only the Samaritan Pentateuch, to which we must again refer.

Moses, an Aramæan, brought up at the Court of Pharaoh, seeing that he was not a native of Egypt, but was a well-educated man, would, for a certainty, be acquainted with the literary language of the Semites of his own time, and, as we may conclude, would compose his writings in cuneiform Babylonian. His sources had also been composed in that language. All of Genesis that relates to matters anterior to Abraham, finishing with Abraham's own genealogy, could have come to Moses only through Abraham, and could have existed only on cuneiform tablets. As to what concerns the biographies of the three patriarchs, that could only have reached Moses in the form of family documents, similar to those documents which, according to Cæsar, the Hel-

vetes, who wrote in Greek, were in possession of, or such as some peoples that are still in a primitive state, like the natives of Madagascar, keep, or such as some nomad tribes have, who keep the genealogies of even their horses. It is plain that Abraham would have continued to write or have caused others to write for him documents of that kind in the language which he carried with him from Mesopotamia, and all the more as that language was as a written language dominant in the land into which he came to sojourn.

The cuneiform Babylonian could have been written only on cuneiform tablets. All the writings of Moses must then have been written in that form. These writings were not in the modern sense books, but collections of tablets which were brought together and distributed into five books, probably by Ezra, just as the Jewish tradition maintains. I reckon that I have here and elsewhere amply shown that this is how the writings of Moses made their appearance; and, in respect of these writings, one should not forget that the greater part, exclusive possibly of the genealogies, are a reproduction of what had been first spoken and proclaimed to the people, and *that* in some instances, as in the case of the laws, repeatedly, before they were committed to writing.

The form of the Mosaic writings is exactly that which the circumstances of his time imposed upon them. Eichhorn, at a time when the cuneiform tablets were unknown, came to an analogous

conclusion. Speaking of Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers, he says, "their form leads one to the conception, that these books, or at least part of them, consist of detached essays, contemporary with the journey of the Hebrews through the wilderness."

Moses was, indeed, a writer, who in this regard acted in unison with the practice of his times, no less than did the scribes of Mesopotamia. Dr. King (*u*) [1] has taught us that the religious literature of the Babylonians was but the transformation of another more ancient religious literature; that, in this transformation, the new authors made their own ideas supervene over the earlier ones, and brought out their own gods in relief to the disadvantage of the older gods. The Assyrians, in their turn, did the same in respect of the Babylonian, as we see in what concerns the legend of Gilgamesh (*v*). M. Langdon (*w*) has discovered in a Sumerian text a very old version of the Deluge and of the Fall. Father Scheil [2] has pointed out, in this connection, that in the Babylonian texts the sign *Ti* has the force both of *rib* and of *life—Hawa*—which latter is the name of Eve. Moses, in a sense, did in respect of Jahveh what the Babylonians did for Marduk. We have, in the earliest chapters of Genesis, Moses' version of the Creation, of the Fall, and of the Deluge—a version which, in some matters, corresponds with

[1] *Babylon*, p. 194.

[2] *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions*, 1915, p. 535.

that of the Babylonians, but is by no means an exact reproduction thereof, for the reason that Moses' version is that which goes with the recognition and worship of Jahveh.

Aramaic and Old Testament Hebrew

This whole point of view, which I again say I base upon the great mass of cuneiform literature which has been preserved for us, is nevertheless, according to M. Humbert, a weak hypothesis which is easily overthrown by the "crushing" facts which go to show that at that time there was a distinct Hebrew written language, and that in that Hebrew language the Mosaic writings [not in the time of Moses] were composed.

Now, in reply, it is necessary, to begin with, to give our terms the meaning that was given them in antiquity. The term *Hebrew*, in the sense of a distinct Hebrew language, is not found in the Old Testament. Two terms are therein made use of to designate the language of the Israelites, i.e. *Jehudith*, the speech of Judea, of Jerusalem; and *the language of Canaan*. To say that these two terms are synonymous, is like saying in our time that Bernese German is the language of Switzerland. It is worth while calling to mind that, for the ancients, a language has no other name than that of the people who speak it, or the country in which, as a language, it is dominant. The moderns have classified their languages

according to their respective characteristics, and according to the family of languages to which they severally belong. Aramaic or Phœnician means for the moderns, Semitic languages which have the recognised Semitic characteristics, with special forms which distinguish them from other languages. But that meaning of these terms, and those classifications of philologists are matters to which the ancients were quite strangers. Aramaic (*Aramith*) did not mean for them more than the language spoken in Aram by its inhabitants (*x*). The case was not otherwise in respect of Phœnician, a term which, for the ancients, meant the language spoken by the Phœnicians, the inhabitants of Phœnicia, whether it made use of a *waw* or not. The ancients were innocent of the distinctions which philologists have, in their grammars, made good.

It results from this, that from the ancient point of view the same name may be applicable to different languages, or dialect. Thus it would be wrong to translate ἑβραϊστί, in every case, by the term, *in Hebrew*, if by Hebrew we mean Hebrew in the sense of the language of the Old Testament Scriptures. The word ἑβραϊστί means "in the language of the Hebrew people." Thus, on the one hand, Ecclesiasticus was, for a long time, known only in a Greek translation, and the translator in his prologue says that it was originally written ἑβραϊστί. The original was discovered at Sinai in 1890; it is in Biblical

Hebrew, written in the usual square characters. Here, then, to use an expression made use of by M. Humbert, there is no doubt as to the meaning of the term.

But, on the other hand, it is not less true that in the New Testament, the term ἑβραϊστί is applied to *Golgotha*, to *Gabbatha*, to *Bethesda*, all which are in Aramaic; and when the Apostle Paul spoke to the people in Jerusalem ἑβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ (*in the Hebrew language*), what is meant is *in the Aramaic language* (Grimm, *Lex.*). Josephus (*y*) by the term *Hebrew* means, sometimes Biblical Hebrew, and at other times Aramaic.[1]

Jehudith means the language of Judah. Of that there is no question.

I am not again to go over a matter which I developed elsewhere at considerable length, concerning *the language of Canaan*.[2] That language, concerning which it was said that it should be spoken in five cities of Egypt (Isa. xix. 18), has actually been discovered in one of the five cities, the most importantof the five, seeing it is mentioned by the prophet Ezekiel (xxix. 10; xxx. 6)—to wit, Syene or Elephantine. And there that language comes to light, not in virtue of an inscription in an aqueduct, or on the stoppers of wine jars, but in virtue of a whole literature which embraces documents of every kind, both public and private: letters, contracts, literary fragments, the history of

[1] Bergsträsser, *Hebr. Grammatik.*

[2] Most recently—*l'Evolution de la langue egyptienne*, p. 162 f.

Ahiqar (y^1), and an Aramaic translation of the Behistun Inscription. These documents show us that Jewish colonists had been settled at Syene for several centuries; that under the Egyptian kings, who could be none other than those of the XXVIth Dynasty, the Saites, the Jews had there a temple which Cambyses spared, but which some Egyptian priests afterwards destroyed. That temple was first built when the Jews, in spite of the repeated warnings of their prophets, fled in crowds to Egypt for fear of the Assyrians. Those Israelites brought into Egypt their form of worship, their God, and also their own proper language, which proves to us that *the language of Canaan* of which Isaiah spoke was Aramaic. It was the literary language of their country, and succeeded the cuneiform. This should be looked upon as a question to be decided by good common sense. Colonists, going to settle in a strange land, were not likely to give up their own proper speech, and especially they were not likely to adopt another language than their own, if that language was not even that of the country into which they came to live. Now, according to M. Humbert, that considerable literature, in which—save for the presence of proper names (Sachau) (z)—there is not found a single Hebrew word, this literature which we owe entirely to Jews established in Egypt for several centuries, proves only that at the period when it was written *Hebrew had perished off the ground, as a popular speech of Canaan.*

The fact that Aramaic became the literary language of Canaan, a language which came to dominate the whole country, and the local dialects in it, proves that the literary language passed through an evolution similar to what one sees in like circumstances everywhere—that is to say, Aramaic succeeded to the place of the cuneiform, without the cuneiform becoming at once obsolete. Ezra in rendering into Aramaic, first of all the law, then other portions of the sacred Scriptures, was merely carrying out his profession as a Babylonian scribe, as one whose constant business it was to render from cuneiform into Aramaic, or *vice versa.* The contracts prove it.

There did exist then an Aramaic version of the sacred Scriptures, and of that there is preserved for us a verse, I mean the first verse of Ps. xxii., a verse which Jesus Christ uttered upon the Cross. That, then, is a fact upon which I lay some weight, notwithstanding that "the hypothesis of an Aramaic Old Testament is superfluous."

The Siloam Inscription (*aa*).—We proceed now to pass in review "the long train of witnesses for the existence of the Bible in common Hebrew," at the time of which we speak, to which my friend appeals. To begin with, let me say that I persist in asking a question which I have repeatedly put to the Higher Critics, and in going on to show how they answer me. I have repeatedly asked that they should show me one single Hebrew text written in the Canaanite character which should

really be the Hebrew of Judah, a text which should be neither Samaritan nor Moabite, nor yet a mere inscription upon an aqueduct.[1] H. Humbert thinks that he "overwhelms" me by his appeal to the Samaritan Pentateuch; but everyone will see that that does not meet my challenge. "Is it not significant," adds my learned opponent, "that no sacred text has been discovered in the cuneiform Accadian, while on the other hand the Hebrew Bible is here before us?" I am always looking for an answer to my question: Cite me a single Judaic passage of the Old Testament which is written in the Canaanite script, and is not in the square Hebrew character. You have not a single verse to appeal to. I show you at least one verse in Aramaic. I claim that the Hebrew Bible written in the Hebrew square character, is not the original form, that, in fact, the most ancient part of the Old Testament was originally written in cuneiform Accadian. You tell me that no part of the sacred text has been discovered in Accadian, while on the other hand you have the Hebrew Bible before you, and that this is one of the facts which prove the extreme weakness of my hypothesis. I do not know how to characterise reasoning of that kind. Certainly, if there is anywhere an instance of *petitio principii* (begging the question), we have a clear instance of that type of reasoning in the case before us.

[1] *Schweich Lectures*, p. 60. *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, t. lxxviii. p. 1.

In that imposing collection of testimonies which you say support your point of view, I find you mention, to begin with, " the vestiges which exist of the Canaanite speech which are of a secular nature, and are found in many documents of an epigraphical character." I look in vain for these numerous vestiges of Canaanite writing, and for that crowd of documents of an epigraphical character. I find of these one only at Jerusalem, the Siloam Inscription, that is to say, six lines, which relate how certain workmen excavating a tunnel and working from opposite directions met at a point. That Inscription belongs to the time of Hezekiah. I have ventured to suggest that the King, as on other occasions, did possibly, on this occasion also, bring to Jerusalem Phœnician workmen, experts in hydraulics, and that it was they that engraved that inscription in their own country's script, and that the text could well be a specimen of the language of the inhabitants of Phœnicia, which probably was very like the vernacular of Jerusalem. In expressing myself thus I reasoned as the ancients would have done. But I committed a great mistake. I had run up against the face of the grammarians, I did not show sufficient respect to their classification. In this case I am not permitted to speak of the language of the Phœnicians, for the reason that a *waw* occurs in the text. In that *waw* consists one of the barriers which the philologists have erected between Hebrew and Phœnician, in their sense of

those terms. Nor is that all. Besides, argue they, seeing that that inscription is correct Hebrew, those six lines must have been the work of a scribe who was very expert in his art; it thus becomes an unexceptionable witness to the use in the eighth century B.C. of Hebrew as a literary language, and, by consequence, to the proposition that it was made use of at that time for the writing of the Holy Scriptures.

An inscription due to workmen, engaged in the making of an aqueduct, ought, one would think, to be written in the popular speech; but even if it is correct Hebrew, even if it does not infringe on the laws which grammarians lay down for that speech, it could not be inferred from six such lines that these lines represented the literary language of the period, and least of all would they be proof decisive of what was the language of the sacred books. Further, even if we might venture to draw an inference in a case where that were all the *data* available, yet in the present debate that is far from being the case! On the contrary, we have before us a whole literature which we owe to Jews long established in Egypt. One of the most important documents which constitute this literature speaks of the temple of the God Jaho or Jahou, a temple which, according to the Critics, must have been erected prior to 621 B.C., the year when, according to them, Deuteronomy established unity of sanctuary. Those Jews, then, were wont in that temple to present their offerings

and whole burnt-offerings, and, as students of the subject have noticed, just in the way according to which they are prescribed in Leviticus. All that is described, not at all in the language of the masons of Siloam, but in Aramaic, that language which as a literary language was evolved from the cuneiform Babylonian.

Nevertheless, that literature is a matter of no weight in the estimation of my adversaries, and is not worthy of being placed in the balance against those six lines of the Siloam excavators. It will be acknowledged that the Critics are not too exacting when it is a question of the proofs upon which they should build up their own theories.

M. Humbert makes no difference between the literary and the spoken language of a people. For him, every spoken language is necessarily a literary language. That conception, when put in that general form, is certainly erroneous, as ever so many facts, open to observation, show. The spoken language may become a written language, and of that we have a striking example in Egypt. Each of the four *patois* of the valley of the Nile became, in the course of time, a literary language, but in order to their being used as literature, they were bound to modify the existent alphabet, and further, that modification is found to have been not exactly identical for any two of them.

As I understand things, the case has not been

otherwise in respect of Hebrew. I never did think of calling in question the high antiquity of Jehudith, as the spoken dialect of Judea. M. Gressmann, as a matter of fact, brought me severely to task for having ventured to say that *Jehudith* had possibly a strong resemblance to the language of the patriarchs when they sojourned in Canaan (*aa*[1]). In the same way, the Sahidic and Memphitic dialects were without question spoken at Thebes and at Memphis centuries before they were reduced to writing, and written they became only after an alphabet suiting those dialects had been discovered.

The Critics always speak of the Hebrew Bible without indicating the alphabet in which that Hebrew was written. My learned opponents forget that we have the Hebrew Bible in square characters only—that is to say, in a script of comparatively recent date. It matters little should that script date from a century or two before the Christian era; its date is certainly long posterior to the Exile. The Critics pay little attention to the question of script. If the Old Testament was written in the Canaanite script, why did later scribes change that alphabet, and on what occasion? Or was the change made, letter for letter, without any modification in the language? If I am not mistaken, no critic would seem to have ever offered an explanation of this change, and yet it is a matter of capital importance. It is objected to me that no authority speaks of a late transition from

Aramaic into Hebrew. I, in turn, ask that my critics should be so good as to point to any author who can tell us, when, how, and why the change from the Canaanite script to the Hebrew square letter was effected.

The supposition of such a change is looked upon as a point established, and nobody nowadays in the study of the Old Testament troubles himself about it. This whole volume, which we have in the script of a late period, was to begin with, it is said, written in the Canaanite script. That matter is regarded as one beyond question, we are not allowed even to suspend judgement. I maintain, until the contrary is proved, that all this is mere conjecture, a sheer hypothesis. You have not one Hebrew word, Judaic Hebrew, in the Canaanite script, save those lines of the Siloam Inscription. And these six lines are, in my opinion, not worthy of being put in the balance against the Aramaic literature of the Elephantine.

The Septuagint.—I have to examine yet two other witnesses to the Hebrew Bible. And, to begin with, there is the Septuagint translation (*bb*). M. Humbert cites instances of transliteration in the Septuagint which are explicable only on the supposition of a Hebrew original. I cannot here give an account of every one of these terms, I choose one only of his list, to wit, Ἀμαφέθ which occurs in LXX, 1 Sam. v. 4, and which, I am told, can only be a transliteration of the Hebrew חַמַּפֶּתָן. One might, to begin with, observe that the translitera-

tion is not very exact; but that, I own, is not a matter of great consequence. The Hebrew word means the threshold. It is preceded by the article, and that, as M. Ehrlich (*cc*) has pointed out, shows that to the temple of Dagon there was only one entrance. The same word, with the article, occurs in Zeph. i. 9, and there the LXX translate by the term *πρόπυλα*. The term מִפְתָּן, without the article, occurs repeatedly. Buxtorf (*cc*[1]), in his Concordance, cites six examples of the Hebrew term, in every one of which the LXX give a Greek rendering. Thus not farther away than the next verse (in 1 Sam. v. 5) they render the word as *βαθμός*, and elsewhere they render by *αἴθριον* (Ezek. ix. 3, x. 4). They have no doubt as to the meaning of the word, not even in the passage which M. Humbert cites. If we read from the LXX what exactly corresponds to the Hebrew, what we find is: *Δαγὼν πεπτωκὼς . . . ἐνώπιον τῆς κιβωτοῦ διαθήκης κυρίου· καὶ ἡ κεφαλὴ Δαγὼν . . . καὶ ἀμφότεροι οἱ καρποὶ τῶν χειρῶν αὐτοῦ πεπτωκότες ἐπὶ τὸ πρόθυρον πλήν . . .* Thus the Hebrew word הַמִּפְתָּן is translated *τὸ πρόθυρον*, that is, *the threshold.* The term *ἀμαφέθ* is a member of an intercalated phrase, *which is not in the Hebrew at all*, which says, in respect of the hands, almost the same as what is said in the following clause, as if indeed the second clause were an interpretation of the first. *καὶ ἀμφότερα τὰ ἴχνη χειρῶν αὐτοῦ ἀφῃρημένα ἐπὶ τὰ ἐμπρόσθεν Ἀμαφὲθ ἑκαστοί.* These words have nothing

corresponding to them in the Hebrew text, and their provenance is another and a different text. Besides, *Ἀμαφέθ* is a word which the LXX did not understand, since they simply transcribe it; and if it had been הַמִּפְתָּן they would certainly have translated it, as they did when it occurs as a member of the following phrase. Besides, if *Ἀμαφέθ* stood for הַמִּפְתָּן, what account can be given of the repetition of the same phrase? That passage then teaches us plainly that the LXX did not translate according to the Hebrew text, but according to another dialect, some words of which occasionally embarrassed them. What is proved seems to me quite clear: It is exactly the antithesis of what M. Humbert imagined that he discovered here.

The Samaritan Pentateuch (*dd*).—I come now, in the present discussion, to the Samaritan Pentateuch, the subject, of late, of very thorough examinations. The scholar who has made it his speciality, and who speaks with the greatest authority on the subject, is Dr. Gaster (*ee*). In his estimation, the Samaritan Pentateuch is the Pentateuch as used by the ten tribes, and consequently dates from a period near to the time when the kingdom was divided. According to M. Humbert, there is no doubt at all that the Samaritans carried off their Pentateuch at the time that they separated themselves from the post-exilian Jews, that is to say, towards the end of the fifth century B.C. This Pentateuch, it is argued,

was written in the Canaanite characters and in the Hebrew language, and that shows that at the end of the fifth century, Hebrew was already a literary language. I allow myself, in reply to M. Humbert, the observation, that the form in which we have the Samaritan Pentateuch is not very ancient; that what we do have is not written in the ancient Canaanite script, but in characters of a more cursive type; that it is possible to regard the present Samaritan characters as derivatives, copied from the Hebrew manuscripts, the oldest of which belong to the tenth century A.D.[1]

For my own part, I should be disposed to place this Samaritan Pentateuch at a somewhat earlier date than does M. Humbert. I do not believe that it was only in the fifth century that the Samaritans introduced into their Pentateuch what is properly characteristic of their worship, as their eleventh commandment, which ordains that they should set up upon Mount Gerizim stones upon which the law should be inscribed. I do not see why the Samaritans should not have done as the Hebrews did later on, that is to say, render the Pentateuch into their own vernacular, the Hebrew of Samaria, and at the same time make use of their own script —a script which, as known from inscriptions discovered as written upon fragments of broken earthenware, was truly their own. That could have been done on the return of Ezra from Babylon, bringing with him, as he did, the Law in Aramaic:

[1] Ph. Berger, *l'Ecriture dans l'antiquité.*

doing this, I say, earlier than the Hebrews did a similar thing, and at the same time wedding the new version to a new alphabet.

I do not see that there is anything crushing to my construction of the history of the transmission of the Law, in these facts. The Samaritan Hebrew, according to M. Humbert, was a literary language in the fifth century, but he will permit me to tell him that that is not the question at issue. The question is: How and on what occasion did the Samaritan Hebrew and the Judaic Hebrew, from being popular languages as they had long been, become literary languages? I maintain that, as was the case in regard to the Coptic, it was just when those languages of the common people were taken and used as the language of the Holy Scriptures. Judaic Hebrew, the language spoken in Jerusalem, became the literary Hebrew when, to begin with, the Law and afterwards the other sacred writings were rendered into that idiom, and when, suitably to that idiom, the Jews adopted a new alphabet, the square Hebrew characters. That does not mean, any more than in the parallel case of the Coptic, that *Jehudith* had been for a long time before then fulfilling the function of a literary and sacred language. I placed this change about the beginning of the Christian era because most philologists assign to that period the origin of the square alphabet, but the date is a matter of indifference. If, seeing that the manuscript of the Hebrew Ecclesiasticus (*ff*) is in square Hebrew

characters, we reckon that the square script came into use about 200 B.C., that merely makes the birth of the Hebrew, what I have elsewhere called the wedding of *Jehudith* with the Hebrew square character, some one hundred years or so earlier than my former computation ; but it is of consequence to note that that circumstance does not affect the fact of a change—a change which may very easily have taken place at Jerusalem later than at Samaria. It is the fact of the change, and not the date, upon which the discussion turns.

By way of retaliation, let it be said that if already in the fifth century the Samaritans had the complete Pentateuch such as we know it now, with the form under which it presents itself to us now, then that circumstance carries with it the overthrow of the system of the Critics, and the confirmation of tradition. The most important document of the Pentateuch, I mean the whole legislative portion thereof, is attributed by the Critics to the Priestly Code, which is said to be the work of a school of priests of the post-exilian period. It thus dates from the second half of the fifth century B.C. Let us take the events in their chronological order : Zerubbabel set to laying the foundation of the temple in 535 B.C. According to the Critics, he could have had only Deuteronomy for Law to guide him. He, however, rebuilt the altar "in order to offer burnt-offerings thereon, as it is written in the law of Moses" (Ezra iii. 21). The prescriptions,

relative to the burnt-offerings, are not found in the book of Deuteronomy, they are found at the beginning of the book of Leviticus, which, if the Critics are right, could only have been written a century later. In 516 the temple was finished, and the dedication thereof celebrated in all respects agreeably to the prescriptions of the book of Moses (Ezra vi. 18), which again at that time could, it seems, only be Deuteronomy. In 457 Ezra came to Jerusalem armed with the edict of Artaxerxes, warranting him to re-establish the worship. But even then the reconstruction of the city made no progress, for in 445 Nehemiah describes for us the great misery and the humiliating situation in which his fellow-countrymen in Jerusalem were placed. The walls of Jerusalem were broken down, and its gates burned with fire. Is it possible to think that in such circumstances, and at that time, there was in Jerusalem a class of learned priests engaged in writing out a code of laws, and a book giving the entire history of Israel from the Creation ? And even if, with Wellhausen, we suppose the Priestly Code to have been completed at Jerusalem in 444, that is not an end of the trouble. The Pentateuch is a composite piece, and the redactor must do his part in bringing together the large number of scattered documents which the Critics profess to have discovered in the text, to wit, the Judaic Jahvist, the Ephraimitish Elohist, the fourteenth chapter of the book of Genesis ; Deuteronomy ; JE, who had undertaken

to weld J and E into one; after that a crowd of authors of the second order, such as the three Jahvists; and, after all that, he must provide himself with matter which we owe to himself alone, which is not found in any of the discoverable sources. Supposing that he set himself to work very shortly after the Priestly Code was finished, he must have worked out his mosaic in an extraordinarily short time, and, most difficult of all, he must have succeeded in getting the priests at Jerusalem to accept his text of the Pentateuch as a sacred text which henceforth was to be recognised as law, into which no change could be introduced. After that, the Samaritans must take cognisance thereof, and also adopt it as their sacred text. But would they, at a time when their hostility to the Jews was most acute, have recognised the authority of a law so recent, a law which had been imposed upon the Jews, one knows not by whom, or on what occasion? We can scarcely suppose the redactor to have finished his work before the fourth century B.C., and still less can we imagine the Samaritans submitting themselves to the commandments of that unknown personality who had constituted himself lawgiver — when, we do not know; even the thought of his existence passed into oblivion.

The Samaritan Pentateuch is exactly like that of the Jews. It is the negation of the mode of composition of the Pentateuch imagined by the Critics, and the more you push back its date, the

more effectively you work the ruin of the critical Pentateuch.

The Law.—I have elsewhere developed [1] what the law of Moses was; I have shown how the manner in which it was transmitted to us, the form which was given it, is that alone which is in entire accord with all those circumstances with which the legislator found himself surrounded, circumstances within which it is up to us to replace it.

Moses was a Semite, an Hebrew brought up at the Court of Pharaoh, that is to say, at the Court of a civilised Realm, the sovereign of a people that were settled and given to agriculture, where everything that related to ownership of property was regulated by law. He was charged with leading into Canaan, into a country, that is, where they were to make a permanent abode, a very numerous tribe, or rather a people, whose special mission it was to worship Jahveh, a Deity of which there was no visible representation.

After the difficulties connected with leaving Egypt were overcome, as soon as Israel arrived in a region where they found themselves safe, that is, at the foot of Mt. Sinai, Moses set himself at once to the business of legislation. It was necessary that the people should arrive in Canaan with a law; to begin with, a religious and moral law, but also with a civil law, since Israel must become a people settled down upon the land, in possession

[1] *La Loi de Moise: Revue de Theologie et Philosophie*, No. 36, August to October, 1920. [English translation by Dean Wace.]

of a country which was to be their own heritage. Religion demanded first that there should be a sanctuary among them, something that should be regarded as the dwelling-place of Jahveh, where He should manifest Himself. As their sojourn in the wilderness was only a provisional state of things, this sanctuary must be one capable of being moved from place to place : thus it was of a portable form, and the ark of the covenant was carried by means of staves, and that sanctuary must suffice up to the time that Jahveh should choose, among the tribes of Israel, a place for a more permanent dwelling.

The journey across the wilderness ought not to be a matter of long duration ; and so it was that in the course of their stay at Mt. Sinai the greatest part of the legislation, that which is contained in Exodus and in Leviticus, was promulgated, as this last book expressly tells us. But the journey was not accomplished in as short a time as Moses at first thought it should be. After they had come to the borders of Canaan, the Israelites revolted, then they suffered defeat at Hormah, with the result that they went back, and for forty years they wandered in the wilderness. It is clear that in the course of this long time, Moses felt bound to modify certain laws given at Sinai, and to add other laws appropriate to their life in the wilderness. The whole law consisted of oral prescriptions, which were without doubt repeated on several occasions, and they were committed to

writing, after they had been promulgated to the people, in the course of their wilderness journey. That circumstance it is that gives that legislation a form so broken and incoherent, and so different from the form of a code of laws such as we have in the Code of Hammurapi.

All these laws were committed to tablets, and, as was the case with regard to all archives containing cuneiform documents, the tablets again were placed in a chest or in a jar; and further, in the present case, were placed by the side of the ark and confided to the Levites, whose business it was to bear this ark about. There is nothing in all that, that is not absolutely conformed to the usage of the period.

Deuteronomy.—Before dying, and on the frontier of Canaan, Moses repeated and gave a résumé of the law in several discourses. These constitute the book of Deuteronomy. In it Moses, who, in the course of a sojourn of forty years, had observed with what readiness the Israelites inclined to forsake Jahveh, insistently and in pathetic terms, urged upon them the consideration that upon fidelity to the commandments of Jahveh their existence depended. Moses was bound in the nature of things to bid Israel such an adieu, and it is the last duty which he fulfilled in respect of them. Eichhorn, one of the fathers of criticism, understood this well: "It (Deuteronomy) is the final résumé of the laws made by the Legislator himself, it is the last voice

of the father and conductor of the people. . . . Every page shows clearly that it is a book written on the brink of the grave." Now when, on every page, we read that these utterances are the words of Moses or what Moses wrote, the method that we follow does not permit us to call in question that it was just so; we accept what is written as true; emphatically so when there is a harmony so perfect between what is said, and the circumstances under which the words were uttered.

I am not to insist upon this matter at greater length, but I do feel obliged to reject with energy the opinion of the Higher Critics touching Deuteronomy. The book, according to them, is a forgery; but they take care not to say it in so many words: "No reputable critic would venture to say of any canonical book that it is a forgery." [1] The *hostile* Critics do not hesitate to call it a forgery, and to attribute it to certain priests, who by this means were minded, with the aid of the King, to bring about a strong reaction in their own favour. I do not hesitate to say that, on the critical view of Deuteronomy, this class of Critics are right in the name which they give the work, and that to the author are applicable the *dictum* of Voltaire: "Such as issue their works under another person's name are really guilty of the crime of forgery." Of course, the Critics (*gg*) cannot allow this term, for that would be a singular way of establishing the authority of Scripture,

[1] Briggs, *The Study of the Holy Scripture*, p. 319.

and *that* they claim to do, in a better way than we, the partisans of tradition. All the same, the name of Moses is used to give authority to what another than Moses wrote, that is to say, in order to deceive the reader or the hearer, and that in this case not once, but on every page and with a persistence that never fails. I repeat it, has a forgery more deserving of the name or more evident ever been seen? If the question concerned a profane Greek or Latin author, no one would hesitate to use the word. The curious circumstance is that this person guilty of forgery was endowed with what M. Humbert calls "a miracle of intuition." Surely he was! Take this example: "Take heed," says he, "in the plague of leprosy that thou observe diligently . . . to do as I commanded you" (Deut. xxiv. 8). He finds it unnecessary to repeat the lengthy instructions which were given Israel concerning lepers. They are contained in chaps. xiii. and xiv. of Leviticus. But according to the Critics, these instructions belonged to the Priestly Code—that is to say, they were by two hundred years posterior to Deuteronomy.

It goes without saying that I fully recognise that the most praiseworthy intentions are attributed to the writer, his ardent wish to put an end to the idolatry which found footing in the land under the reign of Manasseh. Nevertheless the end, even if it be the most honourable, does not justify the means.

CERTAIN OTHER OBJECTIONS REBUTTED.—I wish now to reply to certain objections urged on the part of M. Humbert, as he in them betrays a singular misconception of the situation as it actually existed. I quote him *verbatim*: "We find ourselves (in the Pentateuch) far from the Bedouin of the Steppes of Sinai, far from one who looked upon the conditions there with his own eyes, far from what was possible to a nomadic life. Ours is a conclusion corroborated by an examination of the Mosaic laws, for the major part of these laws transports us into other circumstances than those of the desert, they describe for us the civilisation of an agricultural people settled upon the land. Traditionalists say that Moses had in this way seen into the future, that the law is enacted in view of future eventualities, such as the residence in Canaan, and the institution of royalty. But where could one find in antiquity codes like these, theoretical codes that are not related to the surrounding realities, but, on the contrary, regulating situations that are purely ideal and contingent?"

I beg M. Humbert's pardon for saying so, but it would be difficult to give a more complete travesty of what we really know of Moses and of the Israelites. When was Moses a Bedouin? Were the Israelties whom he brought up out of Egypt, where they had dwelt for centuries, "free children of the desert"?

The legislation has in view a settled and an agricultural form of civilisation, and that is exactly

as it ought to be. The one object towards which the efforts of the Israelites were directed was their establishment in Canaan, and that not at all in order to lead there the life of nomads, but in order to take possession of the land, as of the heritage which had been promised to their fathers; therein to build cities, and to become a great nation. The legislation, to which they were called to yield obedience, was then emphatically due to be such a legislation as had in view a people settled and engaged in agriculture. They quitted Egypt, possibly the most civilised country of that period. Moses and the Israelites too thus knew perfectly what laws should regulate property, and these laws differ but little in any one country from another; save such laws as have respect to religion.

It was at Sinai that the greatest part of that legislation was given, and that circumstance is perfectly easily understood. At that moment they were still as one company, a condition of things that could not be realisable when they came to possess the land of Canaan, when they should be dispersed all over the country. They were then hoping that they would shortly reach the Land of Promise. There was the desert still to pass over, and that would take a certain time, but it was not with a view to establishing themselves in the desert that the Children of Israel left the land of Egypt, nor yet to become nomads dwelling in tents. No one, Moses no more than the rest, could have imagined that, after arriving on the frontiers of

Canaan, at the moment when they had touched that heritage to which they were looking forward, the heritage which had been promised to their father Abraham, and in view of which they had quitted Egypt, the Israelites should turn back, and make a long stay in the desert. The Mosaic law was beyond question meant for a settled and agricultural people, it is the law of Israel, such as Israel behoves to be when they become a people settled in Canaan, the law of the mission which they must work out there. To reject that law as not authentic because it is not a law of Bedouins, because it is a form of "theoretical legislation in view of situations that are purely ideal and contingent"—well, I do not understand that kind of reasoning.

M. Humbert, like all the Critics, does not stick to the text, he gives it a meaning of his own. According to him, Deuteronomy instituted royalty: "What a miracle of intuition that supposes! The prevision of Moses will penetrate far beyond the period of Joshua and of the Judges, and by more than a century in advance, this legislator will adopt such measures as are necessary in view of this novel condition of things. It is psychologically improbable." But it is not so put in the text. Moses is giving his farewell to the people. He is haunted with the fear that Israel, without a guide, and left to themselves, will forsake the worship of Jahveh, and he speaks to Israel beforehand of all the terrible chastise-

ments that such an apostasy will carry in its train. Now, the constitution of the people was a theocracy, God behoved to be their King. That was a new kind of thing, a thing unknown to the peoples in the midst of whom Israel was about to dwell. The Israelites had quitted Egypt, a large kingdom governed by a sovereign whose power they had reason to know. The cities of Canaan had each its own king. Moses might well fear that the example of their neighbours would lead the Israelites to abandon that royalty of Jahveh, and so, with the wisdom that characterised him he gave expression to his fear in the manner of a person stating a possible contingency: "When thou art come into the land which Jahveh giveth thee . . . *if thou shalt say*: 'I will set a king over me like all the nations that are round about me'" (xvii. 14). It is not here a question of ordaining a royalty, it is one of a possible contingency, a very probable eventuality indeed, and one that needs not necessarily carry with it the chastisements of Jahveh, as the violation of the religious laws, for example, was bound to do: only Moses recommends that their king, if there should be such, should not imitate the kings of Egypt.

The Israelite kings must not own many horses. Egypt, under the New Empire, as at a later date, was a country where the horse was reared; the inscriptions tell us of the studs in which their kings interested themselves, and those horses served primarily to yoke them to their own war-

chariots, a fact of which the Israelites were only too well aware.

As to women, there were a great number of them in the palace. A woman was wont to be the living pledge of a treaty, or she was a token of vassalage. An alliance which the king contracted with a foreign nation like the Hittites, an alliance which brought about a condition of peace, used to be cemented with the sending of a princess. That was a kind of gift that was very much in use in Egypt.

All that, then, is strongly reminiscent of what obtained in Egypt, and the recommendation one which was perfectly in place at a time when the people as yet formed but one company, and it was not, as M. Humbert would put it, a miracle of intuition psychologically improbable, for, from the conquest of Canaan onwards, Israel will cease to be one in the sense in which they were one at Sinai.

In the above, as I have been saying, you have an interpretation of the text offered to us by our opponents in order to prove that Moses could not have been the author of Deuteronomy, but, at the same time, it is an interpretation which I cannot discover in the text itself.

Thus, the second principle of our method, according to which the author, with his writing, is placed in his own proper surroundings, in the midst of the exact circumstances of his own time, demonstrates to us that whether we regard the

language or whether we regard the form of the writings, all is in perfect agreement with the times and the manners, in a word, with all that such a writer as Moses must have been.

Before passing to another aspect of our subject, I wish here to reply to M. Humbert in respect of two matters of detail. I (elsewhere) submitted considerations in the sense that in the narrative of Moses there were distinct features which disclosed the hand of a man who knew Egypt thoroughly.[1] But, according to M. Humbert, these features are due rather to circumstances which are true of the Orient in general, and of Mesopotamia in particular. "If in Eden fertility is derived from a river divided into branches, that thought is intelligible in Chaldea, as readily as on the banks of the Nile." I permit myself to make the remark that if one places Eden in Mesopotamia, Eden was watered not at all by a river which was divided into four branches, but by two rivers which joined where the garden terminated. Further, in Mesopotamia there was a rainy season. I do not see what correspondence that can have with what is said of Eden, but, as it seems to me, it is rather in contradiction thereto. It is certain that if that were the only Egyptian trait in the passage referred to, I should not have mentioned it, but it is only one of many traits, which show that for Moses and his contemporaries, Egypt was the fertile land, *par excellence* (*hh*).

[1] Cf. *Archæology of the Old Testament.*

I am reproached for having gone beyond the text in my manner of speaking of the discovery of Deuteronomy by Hilkiah; for, as I am told, it is not said anywhere that the high priest found this document in the foundations of the temple. The Critics, who usually find fault with us for holding so tenaciously to the letter of the text, sometimes attach themselves to it with extraordinary tenacity. The word *foundation* is not there, I admit, but I submit that the reparations were important, since it became necessary to use hewn stones and wood, and in reconstructing the cracked walls, the builders came upon a foundation deposit. Besides, it is an error to imagine that these deposits were in every case under the corner-stone. It is one of the fine discoveries of Professor Petrie (*ii*), to have, for the first time in the history of archæology, discovered a foundation deposit at Naucratis at the four interior angles of a large hall, at a certain depth by the side of the wall. I have myself discovered such deposits in diverse places, in the middle of a hall or under a passage slab. The Babylonian cylinders, giving an account of the foundation of a temple, were often placed in hiding-places after the edifice was built, or, like the historic cylinders of Nabopolassar, were hidden under the pavement of the sanctuary. And if Solomon did this, and therein followed a custom common among both the Egyptians and the Assyrians, I see no reason why there should be special mention of his having done

it, in the narrative (in Kings) concerning the laying of the foundation of the temple.

There are yet several other points to remark upon, in respect of which I differ entirely from M. Humbert, in particular, in respect of what relates to "the institution of the tabernacle," acquaintance with which, it is said, the history of Israel, before the post-exilic period, is innocent of. Reading the text without a preconceived idea in that regard, I find that the tabernacle was only the envelope of the ark, which was considered as the dwelling-place of Jahveh. Now it seems to me that the ark played a grand rôle in what is related to us of the history of Israel up to the building of the temple.

CHAPTER IV

THE PENTATEUCH OF THE CRITICS

Our Third Principle.

I SHOULD like now in the present connection to discuss a third principle on which, for my part, I lay great weight. I reckon that when it is a question of writings such as we have in the Old Testament, and in particular in the Pentateuch, it is a matter of primordial importance that one render to oneself some account of the aim of these writings, of their *raison d'être*, that we ask ourselves who were the men to whom they were addressed, and what kind of influence were they likely to exert on those addressed. Why was the Pentateuch written? Or, in more detail, why were Genesis, and the four books which compose the law, written? What had the author in view when he wrote them out?

These are questions with which the Critics never seem to burden themselves. Otherwise, they could never have reconstructed these books as they have done. And, in fact, I am here dealing with an order of ideas to which they attach no importance, yea, so much is that the case, that a critic wrote to me recently in the sense that

reasoning of this kind had no significance for science, because that it was possible with stones, taken from different quarries, to construct an edifice that should form a unit. Yet even then it might be necessary to know who constructed this unit, what engaged him to do it, and what purpose was it meant to serve.

In a recent publication,[1] I expounded the view that Genesis has as its central idea, that towards which all converges, the election of Israel for Jahveh as His people—a people who had a special mission to fulfil in Canaan. There only could the covenant of Jahveh with His people be properly realised. Genesis is the necessary introduction to the four following books which with it make up the Pentateuch. That collection of books forms a totality, which rests upon this basis: The covenant of Jahveh with His people, the way according to which that covenant was entered into, the obligations which the covenant imposed upon Israel.

Genesis, then, is a book in which the unity of thought is perfect, and it is written with a perfectly well-defined aim. It is the charter of the covenant, the title which beforehand guaranteed to the Israelites the land of Canaan as their possession. It was fitted to convince them that they were under obligations to quit Egypt, to endure the hardships of a journey through the wilderness, and to go in and take possession of Canaan. This undertaking

[1] Cf. *Archæology of the Old Testament*, p. 52.

was Jahveh's appointment for them, with a view to the fulfilling of His promise to them. Who, other than Moses, I ask, could set all that before them ? Who had the necessary authority to make them resolve to go forth ? For, as we learn from the narrative, it was not an easy thing either to move them to action, or to overcome the resistance of the king. And what other means had Moses in bringing the Israelites to make up their mind to leave Egypt ?

This, for the Critics, is a question of so little importance that it does not so much as give them a thought. It was not Moses who thus addressed the people. What did he say to them ? We know *that* only through unknown authors who must have lived centuries later than Moses, and these authors contradict each other.

The Pentateuch of the Critics.

Over against the Genesis of tradition, that creation of an admirable logic that suffers no break, of which the aim is so clear and so easy to understand, let us place that of the Critics. I do not know how to characterise it : A tissue of heterogeneous fragments, stitched badly together, which we owe to an author who wished to write an historical book, without having any settled idea as to the obligations which such an undertaking imposed upon him. He had an interest in the origin and ancient history of Israel, and in his desire to narrate them had recourse to a crowd

of diverse documents. He commenced with two of these documents which contradict one another in the most absolute manner. The Jahvist gives a very captivating account of the life of Abraham, and of his relations with Jahveh. But straightway, following the Elohist or the Priestly Code, he will give us to understand that nothing of all that could have happened, because that Abraham never knew Jahveh. With a view of giving a touch of homogeneity to his work, this redactor will occasionally correct the ancient documents, introducing the name Elohim, where his source had Jahveh. He then completes the documents, and his revision of them, by giving some information of his own fabrication, in respect of which we do not too well know what his sources might have been. He gave form, too, to scenes purely according to his own conception of things, inclusive even of genealogies which were not in his sources; and in carrying out this construction, he made use of mere fragments, phrases, or even single words taken from here and there, and thus brings out a composition which he did not, in that form, find in any of his sources, as, for example, the genealogy of chap. x.; the account of the covenant with Abram given in chap. xv.; the report of the visit of Joseph to his father in xlviii. He did not, as Astruc thought, copy the ancient authors; he uses his sources as it pleases him.

In fact, this redactor is the real author of Genesis. Without him we should have had only scattered

pieces. Who, then, is this writer to whom we owe this work? To begin with, When and where did he live? He could not have done his part of the work earlier than the fourth century B.C., for the reason that the Priestly Code, that framework of the history of Israel, which reaches up to the Creation, the scholarly work of a school of priests, a work which he must have regarded as authoritative, dates, according to some critics, only from the end of the fifth century B.C. This product "of the religious sentiment of post-exilic Judaism" was not born in a day. And the examination of all the elements that go to form his book was bound to have been a kind of labour that took him a long breath. Where was this unknown person born? At Jerusalem, or in Egypt, to which the Jewish community then attached more importance? What was the aim of the redactor? He had no mission like Moses or the Prophets. If, like Ezra, he was specially occupied with the study of the law, how did he bring it about that his name should have gone into oblivion?

The motives that engaged him to write Genesis are really inexplicable. The Jews, who were at the time very feeble and few in number, the rags, as one may say, of the kingdom of Judah, had succeeded in taking possession of Jerusalem. In spite of great difficulties, they were able to rebuild their temple; but their very existence, as an independent little people, was very precarious.

Yet it was just at that moment that this writer reminded them that Jahveh had said to Abraham: "Rise, go through this country, in its length, and in its breadth; for to thee will I give it." In a later passage Jahveh says to the Israelites: "I am about to make Myself known to you by fulfilling My promises. I am Jahveh, and the enemy, Pharaoh, will know that I am Jahveh." I ask if all that would not have been for the Jews of the fourth century, and still more for those that fought with Antiochus, the most cutting of ironies? Was that, at that time, the correct means to inspire confidence in Jahveh? Could that book, which sets forth promises so brilliant, take on, at the time of its supposed composition, the character of the pre-eminently sacred book, or could it be accepted as such, if given forth, for the first time, at the moment when the facts of the case seemed to contradict it in the most cruel form?

I do not hesitate to say that the Genesis of the Critics is a book that had no *raison d'être.* No one can see to whom it should address itself. It could not have been to the Jews of the fourth century, for whom far from being a sacred book, it could have been only a derision. Why then should the author have written it? And how should that author, who is supposed to have done more for the law than Moses and Ezra, have remained absolutely unknown, while we know the names of the other two legislators?

And what of the remainder of the Pentateuch of the Critics ? Deuteronomy is inspired with the most praiseworthy sentiments on the part of the person who wrote it. But it is none the less a forgery, for from the beginning to the end the writer claims to report only what Moses said or wrote, because he felt that he was under a necessity to make use of the name of Moses.

As to the three other books, I restrict myself to a repetition of what in this connection M. Humbert wrote : " No legislation relative to the worship, although it is post-exilic, mentions the temple ; it speaks only of the tabernacle. The fact is, the conception of the tabernacle of the wilderness is a post-exilian fiction, and presupposes the existence, at the time, of the temple, and of the realisation of unity of worship. Everything in that fiction indirectly attests to the existence of the temple. When, apparently, *à propos* of the tabernacle, we observe a distinction made between two different classes of officials, a distinction unknown to history before the time of Ezekiel, we recognise at once that that distinction made by the Priestly Code reflects exactly what held true in the second temple, of which one secures, in this way, a negative photograph."

Thus, all this, that was really meant to regulate the worship and the ritual of the new temple, had form given in an indirect manner. Thus, the legislation—the precepts whereof the priests and the faithful will read in the temple of Jerusalem,

although some of them were inapplicable — is conceived of as having for its object an ark, a dwelling-place of Jahveh, which the priests were supposed to carry on bars through the wilderness. The worship is conceived as though it were that of the tabernacle, the appearance and structure of which is minutely described although it never had an actual existence. The Priestly Code places it at the period of the Exodus, because this gives it the appearance of an historical reality, and renders it the legal postulate of the unity of worship. Need I say more? Did not M. Humbert himself tell us, that "the men of antiquity were innocent of theoretical legislation that did not attach itself to the realities with which they were surrounded"?

Behold, then, what the critical method reduces the Pentateuch to, those five books of Moses, which the New Testament refers to, as, Moses: a book that had no *raison d'être*, a pious fraud, the negative photograph of a fictitious picture. Such is the Pentateuch of the Critics.

M. Humbert tells me that I have by no means placed the correct manner of conceiving the origin and the formation of the Pentateuch in peril, for the reason that I have brushed aside the essential reasons that can be put forward in favour of the critical thesis. My learned opponent, who is himself a critic, could not have concluded otherwise, and I am not at all astonished to find him write after that manner. But I trust that I have,

both here and in earlier works, demonstrated that the Higher Criticism, as it is taught in all the French-speaking Protestant Faculties of theology, wrongly claims to be the expression of the truth. Over against that method, there is, in this regard, another method as scientific as itself, but which starts from an opposite principle. That principle consists in taking the texts just as they were written, in their proper and literal sense, in interpreting them in the simplest manner possible, in allowing them in a childlike spirit to make their own proper impression upon us without mixing with them anything of our own. It is clear that ours is a method that is irreconcilable with that on which the coryphæi of the Higher Criticism base their results. The question is, which of these two methods is the more likely to lead to the truth. As for us, defenders of tradition in all the domains of literature, our choice is made.

NOTES BY THE TRANSLATOR

(*a*) : Jullian, Camille ; b. at Marseilles, 1859. Professor of the Faculty of Letters, Bordeaux; one of the collaborateurs of *la Grand Encyclopedie*. Author of *l'Histoire de la Gaule*, which is not yet finished. One of Fustel de Coulanges's literary executors. See Note (*h*).

(*b*) : Briggs, Charles A. ; b. in New York, 1841. Professor of Hebrew and cognate languages in Union Theological Seminary from 1874 to 1891, then of Biblical Theology on to 1904, then of Theological Encyclopædia. Author of *The Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch* ; *The Study of the Holy Scripture*, etc. d. 1921.

(*c*) : Doumergue, Emile ; b. at Nîmes, 1844. Hon. Dean of the Protestant Faculty of Montaubon. Prolific writer, but best known in this country as author of *The Life of Calvin*, in four vols.—a monumental work.

(*c*[1]) : Bruston, Ch. Professor of Hebrew at Montaubon. Author of *Les Cinq Documents de la loi Mosaïque*, etc.

(*d*) : Kyle, Melvin G., Egyptologist; b. near Cadiz, O., 1858. Professor of Biblical Archæology, Xenia Theological Seminary. Editor of the Archælogical Department of *The Sunday-School Times* ; editor of *The Bibliotheca Sacra* ; Lecturer (1921) in the American School of Oriental Researches, Jerusalem. Author of *Moses and the Monuments*, etc.

(*e*) : *Chorizontes* (Gr. χωρίζω, I separate), a name given, in the first instance, to those grammarians who taught that *The Iliad* and *The Odyssey* were the works of two different

poets. The name is now extended so as to include, among others, critics who distribute the books of Moses among anything from five to fifteen different authors.

(*f*) : 1. Jullian, Camille, seems to have established the thesis that Turold was author of that epic of the middle ages, *Chanson de Roland.*

2. Bédier, Joseph ; b. Paris, 1861. Professor of French Literature in the Middle Ages in the College of France. Wrote *Recherches sur la formation des chansons de geste*, etc.

3. Lot, M., one of the lecturers of l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes, has written a book on *Launcelot of the Lake*, in which he shows that this work, which had been divided between ten or twenty different authors, is the work of one author.

(*g*) : 1. Wolf, Friedrich Aug. ; b. 1759, Hanoverian. Author of *Prolegomena to Homer* (1795)—a thorough-going partitionist. d. Marseilles, 1824.

2. Grimm, Jacob Carl ; b. 1785, Hesse-Casselite. Discoverer of " Grimm's Law." Author of *Deutsches Wörterbuch*, etc. His brother, Wilhelm Carl Grimm, lived with him, and collaborated with him in most of his works.

3. Niebuhr, Barthold G. ; b. at Copenhagen, 1776. Before Mommsen, he was *the* historian of ancient Rome. d. at Bonn, 1831.

4. Mommsen, Theodore ; German scholar and historian ; b. 1817. In 1858 became Professor of Ancient History in Berlin. Equally remarkable for native talent and for industry. His best known work is a *History of Rome.* d. 1902.

(*h*) : Fustel de Coulanges, French historian ; b. at Paris, 1830. Professor of History of the Faculty of Letters at Strassburg, where in 1864 he published his *la Cité Antique*, a work which ranks as one of the masterpieces of the French language in the nineteenth century. He is recognised as leader of what, in contradistinction to the school of the Higher Criticism, may be called the Historical School. M. Naville, in his *Schweich Lectures*, p. 2, says : " Fustel de

Coulanges's book, *la Cité Antique*, is in my opinion the type of what historical research should be. I am happy to say he has now made disciples in France, and this school is becoming every day more prominent." He died at Massy, 1889.

(*i*) : Cf. W. H. Green's *Unity of Genesis, in loc.*

(*j*) : Second tablet, see Note (*s*).

(*k*) : 1. Osterwald, Jean F. ; b. at Neufchâtel, 1663. Protestant theologian ; pastor of his native town, where he died, 1747. Honourably known as the author of a *Traduction de la Bible*, 1724.

2. Olivétan, Pierre Robert, French Biblical scholar ; b. at Noyon in Picardy, *c.* 1506 ; d. at Ferrara in 1538. A cousin of John Calvin. He translated the whole Bible into French (1536). Osterwald's version is a revision of Olivétan's French Bible.

(*l*) : Cf. W. H. Green's *Unity of Genesis, in loc.*

(l^1) : Cowley, A. E., Librarian, Bodleian Library, Oxford. Works : *The Original Hebrew of a portion of Ecclesiasticus* ; *Aramaic Papyri found at Assuan*, etc.

(*m*) : Astruc ; b. 1684 at Suaves. Became Regius Professor of Medicine at Paris ; d. 1766. Chiefly known by his *Conjectures sur la Memoires*, etc., which was published at Paris, 1755.

(*n*) : Eichhorn, Johann G. ; b. 1752 at Dörrenzummern. An eminent scholar, and a writer on Biblical Criticism. His *Introduction to the Old Testament* appeared in 1824. d. 1827.

(*o*) : Bennett, W. H., English Congregationalist ; b. at London, 1855. Since 1891 Professor of O.T. Exegesis in New College, London. Edited "Joshua," in the *Rainbow* or *Polychrome Bible*, and "Genesis," in the *Centenary Bible*.

(o^1) : Wellhausen, Julius ; b. 1844 at Hameln. The Protagonist of the Higher Criticism as that affects the Old Testament. Author of *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, etc.

(*p*) : Dillmann, C. F. August, German Lutheran ; b. at

Illingen, 1823. A distinguished Ethiopic scholar, author of *A Commentary on Genesis*, etc. d. in Berlin, 1894.

(p^1) : Skinner, John ; Principal of Theological College of Presbyterian Church of England, Cambridge. Author of *Commentary on Genesis*, in " Int. Cr. Com. Series," etc.

(p^2) : Kuenen, Abraham, Dutch Theologian and Biblical scholar ; b. at Haarlem, 1826. Author of *Historico-Critico Inquiry into the Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch*. d. 1891.

(p^3) : Elephantine or Yeb : an island in the Nile, over opposite Assuan, *c.* 550 miles south of Cairo. On this island a Jewish colony had long been settled. In it, in 1907 (and before), an unprecedentedly large number of papyri were discovered. They were all composed in Aramaic, and were of the nature of letters, legal documents, etc. They were written by Jews in the period 494 B.C.–405 B.C. See Professor Van Hoonacker's *Schweich Lectures*.

(q) : Gautier, C. L., Swiss Reformed ; b. at Cologny, 1850. From 1877 to 1898 he was Professor of O.T. Exegesis at Lausanne. Author of *Introduction to the Old Testament*.

(r) : Contenau, G. See *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, vol. lxxxi. pp. 316–332.

(s) : 1. By *The Language of Moses*, M. Naville means the language in which Moses wrote the Pentateuch, that is, Babylonian. Babylonian was ever written in the cuneiform script. In the expression " cuneiform Babylonian," " cuneiform " stands for the script, and " Babylonian " for the language. " Babylonian " sounds strange, but probably no Semitic language is so near the Hebrew as Babylonian. It was the language of Ur of the Chaldees, and so of Abraham. What is really difficult is the Babylonian script or cuneiform, which is not an alphabet ; or an alphabetical kind of writing : " Cuneiform is not properly a writing, it does not consist in the drawing of a sign, it is an impression made with a stylus, and the number and directions of these impressions constitute the sign. Cuneiform

can be imitated on stone, it can be engraved; but the stylus cannot act on anything except wet clay, or some material of the same kind. It cannot be impressed on papyrus or skin, it cannot be written with ink. Therefore a cuneiform book must be necessarily made of one or several clay tablets, which will either be merely dried or generally baked. Fire made them a lasting thing, very appropriate for valuable documents which had to be preserved. They could be transported with much greater safety than a papyrus roll" (Naville's *Schweich Lectures*, p. 40).

2. *Aramaic* is that Semitic dialect in which Ezra iv. 8–vi. 19, vii. 12–27, and Dan. ii. 4–vii. 28, and two other very brief portions of the O.T. are written. Aramaic (language and script) gradually superseded Babylonian in Babylonia from the ninth century B.C. onwards, and must have been in occasional use at a much earlier date in Babylon. "There are several Aram, Aram-Naharaim, Aram Zobah, and others are also found. Aram stands for an ethnic group—the most important one of the old Semitic branch" (Naville, *Archæology*, p. 167). In the time of Nehemiah, "the Jews of Elephantine, Samaria, Jerusalem, Susa and Ecbatana, all used the Aramaic as the language of business and correspondence" (R. D. Wilson, *PThR* xvii. 425). It was the mother tongue of the Jews of Palestine in the time of our Lord. It is the language of the Targums.

3. Hebrew and Phœnician are almost identical. It was certainly a spoken language in the days of Khu-n-aten. In this dialect all the O.T., as we now have it, with the exception of the passages referred to under 2, is written.

The Semitic family of languages may be conveniently distributed into two groups: Group I. (*a*) Babylonian, inclusive of Assyrian; (*b*) Aramaic, inclusive of Syriac; (*c*) Hebrew, inclusive of Phœnician. Group II. (*a*) Arabic; (*b*) Ethiopic. The members of Group I. are very closely related.

(*t*): Tel el-Amarna was the capital of Egypt in the days of Khu-n-aten, who was Tutankhamen's father-in-law. In

1887 a jar, containing some 300 letters, all written on tablets in Babylonian cuneiform, was discovered at this spot. The letters are either to or from Amenophis III. or his son Khun-aten, their correspondents being subjects or auxiliaries of the kings of Egypt in Asia Minor or (chiefly) in Syria. Seven of the letters are from Abd-hiba, king of Jerusalem.

(t^1) : 1. Winckler, Hugo, German Protestant, Orientalist ; b. at Gräfenhainichen, 1863. In 1904 became Professor of Semitic Philology in Berlin. He edited the Tel el-Amarna tablets with translation. He was in process of conducting excavations at Boghaz-Keui, in Asia Minor, that were extremely fruitful and interesting, when the Great War broke out and put an end to archæological research in Asia Minor. Dr. Winckler did not survive the war.

2. Nippur, revered in ancient times as the home of the earliest Bel of Babylonia. "Ur, Erech and Nippur remained for millenniums the triad of the most holy places of Babylon." The excavations of the University of Pennsylvania which were carried out at Nippur proved unusually fruitful. See H. V. Hilprecht's *Excavations in Assyria and Babylonia*, 1904.

3. Kouyunjik is the ancient Nineveh. Layard here discovered the library of Assurbanipal.

4. Rassam, Hormuzd (1826–1910), Assyriologist ; b. at Mosul. Assisted Layard and afterwards Rawlinson at excavations at Kouyunjik. His imprisonment in Abyssinia led to war with Britain.

5. Hilprecht, Hermann V. ; b. 1850. Became Clark Research Professor of Assyriology and Scientific Director of the Babylonian Expedition, University of Pennsylvania. Author of *Explorations in Bible Lands during the 19th Century*. d. .

(t^2) : Code of Hammurapi : Hammurapi is by Orientalists generally identified with Amraphel, Abraham's contemporary. A code of criminal, civil, prohibitive and prescriptive law, which Hammurapi enacted, was discovered

at Persepolis by M. J. de Morgan. It had been cut into a stele of black diorite, and written in cuneiform. It has many points of resemblance with Ex. xxi.–xxiii. and with certain parts of Deuteronomy.

(t^3) : *Glosses* : These glosses in the Tel el-Amarna tablets are interesting, as they prove that Phœnician, which is scarcely distinguishable from Hebrew, was a spoken language in Syria, inclusive of Jerusalem, as early as 1400 B.C. In 300 letters which have come down to us on the Tel el-Amarna tablets, it is reckoned that there were, when they were complete, some 8000 words. Some 70 Phœnician or Hebrew words are still found in those tablets, and some of these are several times repeated. They are not marginal glosses, but occur in the very text of the letters, as if one used to speak the Scottish dialect from childhood, in writing a letter in English should, now and again, introduce a word belonging to his own vernacular.

(t^4) : The Canaanite script : The general opinion among scholars is that this script is the oldest form of alphabetical writing in existence. Its own provenance was probably Crete, and from it is derived the Greek and the Roman alphabets, and possibly all the alphabets in the world. The Greek alphabet is much nearer to the Canaanite script than it is to the square Hebrew characters. The Canaanite and the Phœnician script are one.

(u) : King, Leonard W. Author of a *History of Babylonia and Assyria*, from prehistoric times to the Persian Empire, 3 vols.

(v) : Gilgamesh : a Babylonian epic, said to be "the earliest which contains the world-wide thought of a means of escape from death." Cf. Naville's *The Old Egyptian Faith*, for a parallel thought in Egypt.

(w) : 1. Langdon, Stephen, Professor of Assyriology, Oxford. Author of *A Sumerian Grammar*, and *Christomathy*, with a vocabulary of the principal roots in Sumerian.

2. Scheil, V., eminent Assyriologist. Cf. Nicol's *Recent Archæology and the Bible*, p. 332.

(*x*) : Aramith, cf. Note (*s*, 2).

(*y*) : Josephus, Flavius, the well-known Jewish historian ; b. at Jerusalem, A.D. 37. Wrote *The History of the Jewish Wars*, etc. He lived up to the year A.D. 100.

(*y*[1]) : Ahiqar, hero of a widespread legend to the effect that he was at once the author of a number of proverbs, a chancellor to Sennacherib, and an architect to a Pharaoh. "The Aramaic work of Ahikar was buried at Elephantine for 2300 years, but has now been unearthed" (R. D. Wilson's *Is the Higher Criticism Scholarly*, p. 54). See Jobib i. 21 ; Agnes Smith Lewis's *The Story of Aḥiḳar*.

(*z*) : Sachau, Edward, Orientalist ; b. at Neumünster, 1845. Became Professor of Oriental Languages in Berlin in 1876 ; the chief authority on the Elephantine Papyri. Author of *Drei Aramäische Papyrus*, etc.

(*aa*) : The Siloam Inscription : discovered in 1880 in the conduit in Jerusalem which leads from the Virgin's Spring to the Pool of Siloam. It was probably written during the reign of Hezekiah. It consists of six lines, as it is generally said, in Hebrew. M. Naville thinks it may have been written by workmen from Tyre. It is in the current Phœnician script of the period.

(*aa*[1]) : Gressmann, Hugo, German Protestant ; b. at Mölln, 1877. Privat-docent of O.T. Exegesis at University of Thiel.

(*bb*) : The Septuagint : A Greek translation of the Old Testament, done at Alexandria, Egypt. The five books of Moses were thus rendered in the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus, *c.* 275 B.C. It was finished, one would say, not later than 150 B.C., and possibly considerably earlier. It contains the O.T. and the O.T. Apocryphal books. The common opinion has been that it was rendered from Hebrew into Greek. M. Naville is inclined to think it was rendered from Aramaic into Greek.

(*cc*) : Ehrlich, Eugen, b. 1862 at Czernowitz. An eminent jurist. Author of a *History of Roman Law*.

(*cc*[1]) : Buxtorf, John ; b. 1564 at Camen, Westphalia. In

1590 became Professor of Hebrew in Basel, where he died in 1629. The work upon which his reputation rests is his *Lexicon Chaldaicum, Talmudicum et Rabbinicum.*

(*dd*) : The Samaritan Pentateuch. There is practically no difference between the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Hebrew Pentateuch, save that the Hebrew is written in the square character, and the Samaritan in a script that appears to be somewhat nearer the Old Phœnician. Dr. Gaster dates this Samaritan Pentateuch not much later than the time of Jeroboam, the son of Nebat; the late Mr. J. Iverach Munro, about the time when the ten tribes were carried into Assyria. The Higher Critics assign a much later date. There is a Samaritan Targum of the Pentateuch, but it is much later, and is in Aramaic.

(*ee*) : Gaster, Moses; b. Bucharest, 1856. A distinguished Jewish scholar, was repeatedly chosen President of the Zionist Congress. Wrote *The Samaritan Book of Joshua*, etc. Lives in London.

(*ff*) : Ecclesiasticus—not Ecclesiastes—was written in Hebrew by Ben-Sirach. It was translated by his grandson into Greek, in third or second century B.C. It forms part of O.T. Apocrypha.

(*gg*) : Critics : M. Naville by the terms *hostile critics* and *critics*, distinguishes critics who are anti-supernaturalists from critics who are supernaturalists.

(*hh*) : M. Naville is not suggesting that the Garden of Eden was on the Nile, but merely that, to Moses, Eden (which only Adam and Eve had experienced) had some analogy with the Delta. Cf. Gen. xiii. 10; also Naville's *Archæology of the Old Testament*, pp. 36–43.

(*ii*) : Petrie, W. M. Flinders; b. London, 1853. Since 1892 Professor of Egyptology, University College, London. Author of *Six Temples at Thebes*; *Royal Tombs of the First Dynasty*, etc.

WORKS BY THE SAME AUTHOR

Archæology of the Old Testament. Was the Old Testament written in Hebrew? London: Robert Scott, 1913.

The Text of the Old Testament. "The British Academy Schweich Lectures." London: University Press, 1915.

The Law of Moses. With Preface by Henry Wace, D.D., Dean of Canterbury. London: Chas. T. Thynne, 1922.

The Old Egyptian Faith. Translated by Colin Campbell, M.A., D.D. London: Williams & Norgate, 1909.

INDEXES

I. SUBJECTS

Aaron, 63 f.
Abraham, 17 f., 18 f., 29, 38 f.
Abram, 45 f., 84 f.
Accadian, 89 f.
Adam, 15.
Adam's companion, 14.
Ahiqar, 104.
Amurri, 93.
Anglo-Saxons, 1.
Anthropoid apes, 15.
Aramaic, 62, 88, 102.
,, (words), 103.
Arphaxad, 56.
Astruc, 21, 22 f., 23 f., 24 f., 25, 26, 27, 28 f., 29, 52, 75, 83, 84.
Authenticity, 3.
Authors, 37.

Babylon, 32.
Babylonian philosophy, 86.
Balaam, 68.
Bedier, M., 9.
Behistun inscription, 104.
Bennett, Dr., 31, 32, 38, 39.
Bérard, M. Victor, 10.
Bernese German, 101.
Better method, 8, 9 f.
Bevy of writers, 82.
Bible (German), 91.
Bigots, 7.
Boab (Arabic), 35.
Boghaz Keui, 93 f.
Book—Modern Sense, 35.
Briggs, Dr., 2 *bis*, 6, 10, 40, 122.
Bruston, Ch., 8, 11.
Buxtorf, 73, 112.

Cæsar, 98.
Cairo, 35.
Canaan, 57.
Candace, eunuch of, 35.
Catholic priest, 7.
Centenary Bible, 31, 53 (*n*), 82, 85.
"Chorizontes," 9.
Codes of laws, 4.
Contenau, M. G., 86.
Coptic language, 91, 115.
Coulanges, Fustel de, 12, 20.
Covenant (with Abraham), 67.
Cowley, M., 16 (*n*).
Creation, 44 *passim*.
Credibility, 4.
Critics, 4 *passim*.
Cuneiform, 68 f.
,, Babylonian, 92.

Dagon (temple of), 112.
Decalogue, 28 f., 74.
Destructive School, 1, 4.
Deuteronomist, 26, 31, 59.
Deuteronomy, 3, 26, 39. 121 f.,
,, (age of), 108.

Dillmann, 47 f., 48 f., 49.
Doumergue, M. E., 8, 59.

E., 31, 48, 49.
Ecclesiastes, 40.
Ecclesiasticus, 116.
Eden, 129.
„ Garden of, 15.
Egypt, 42, 54.
„ (dialects of), 109.
Egyptians, 54 *passim*.
Egyptian culture, 119 f.
„ language, 54.
Ehrlich, M., 112.
Eichhorn, 23 f., 24, 27, 99, 122.
Elephantine, 16 (*n*), 62, 103.
Elohim, 13, 14, 16 f., 18 f., 21 f., 24, 36, 50.
Elohim and Jahveh as Criteria, 50.
Elohist, 23 f., 24, 25 f., 26, 39 f., 44, 46, 50 f., 51.
Elohist (Ephraimitish), 117.
Elohists, First and Second, 26, 39.
El Shaddai, 65, 67 f.
Enosh, 17, 49, 65.
Ephraimite, 28, 41, 48.
Esau, 84.
Etymology (popular), 68.
Exodus iii. 13 (interpreted), 60 f.; vi. 2 (interpreted), 67 f., 73.
Ezekiel, 68, 71, 72.
Ezra, 23, 40, 99.

Fall, the, 15.
Finance, ancient, 10.
First principle, 12.
Flood, 44 *passim*.
Four points, 2.
France, 20.

Galileo, 7.
Gaster, Dr., 113.
Gautier, 25 (*n*), 46, 53, 84.
Genesis, 12 f.
German historiography, 9.
„ method, 30.
„ scholars, 17.
Germany, 20.
Gilgamesh, 100.
Glosses, 95 f.
God, 13 f.
„ the Creator, 51.
„ image of, 14.
„ of Israelites, 17.
„ of man, 51.
Grand Critical Objection, 59.
Gressmann, M., 110.
Grimm, 10.
Grundschrift, 25, 43.

Ham, 57.
Hammurapi, 95, 121.
Haute Critique, 1.
Hebrew, 62, 88.
Hebrews, 44.
Helvætes, 98.
Herodotus, 24.
Heroic poems, 10.
Hexateuch, 3 *bis*, 4, 26 f., 31, 40.
Higher Criticism, 1 *bis*, 2 *ter*, 3 *bis*, 5 f., 6 f., 7 f., 8 f., 10 f.
Higher Critics, 33 *passim*.
Hilprecht, 94.
Historical Method, 12.
History of Israel, 2.
Hittites, 93 f.
Holy Scripture, 6.
Homer, 10.
Humbert, M., 11, 20, 74, 80, 81, 88, 89, 95, 97, 101, 103, 104, 106, 109, 113, 114, 123, 124, 125, 126, 128, 131, 138, 139.
Hyper-Criticism, 1.

IHVH, 61.
Infallibility, 7.
Integrity of the Book, 2.
Intercommunings, 15.
Isaac, 17 f.

Isaiah, 40.
Israel, 27.
Israelites, 16, 20.

J, 31, 47 f., 48, 49 f.
J1, 52, 59.
J2, 52.
Jaho, Jahou, } 16 (*n*), 108.
Jahveh, 16 f., 18 f., 19 f., 21 f., 24, 25 f., 36, 37, 38 f., 41, 43, 50.
Jahveh Elohim, 17 f., 19, 51 f.
„ His Name, 46.
„ (meaning of), 75, 79.
Jahvist, 23, 24, 25, 37, 38 f., 39, 45, 47, 51 f.
Jahvist (age of), 77.
Jahvists, 31 f., 32, 39.
JE, 31, 39 f.
„ (age of), 83.
JED, 84.
JEDP, 84.
Jehovah God, 15.
Jehudith, 91, 101, 103, 110, 115.
Jeremiah, 71.
Jerusalem, 32.
Jethro, 42, 63.
Jews, 16 (*n*).
Joseph, 29 ff.
Joshua (Book of), 26, 32 f., 41 f., 42.
Josiah, 26.
Judaic document, 39, 118.
Judaist, 48.
Jullian, M. Camille, 1, 9.

Kautzsch and Socin, 53.
Kharri, 93.
King, 100.
Koran, Dr., 35.
Kouyunjik, 92, 94.
Kuenen, 59 f., 65.
Kyle, Dr., 9.

Lamentations, 40.
Lancelot of the Lake, 10.
Langdon, 100.
Language of Canaan, 101, 103, 104.
Laws of the Twelve Tables, 10.
Leviticus, 44.
Livy, 26.
Lot, M., 10.
Lower Criticism, 2.
Luther (dialect of), 90.

Malagasians, 19.
Man, Creation of, 13.
Manipulation of Text, 11.
Manuscripts, 2.
Marduk, 100.
Massoretic Text, 24.
Mesopotamia (Scribes of), 100.
Method of Higher Critics, 20, 32.
Method, History of, 20.
Method of Higher Critics Tested, 34.
Methods (The Two), 12.
Mommsen, 10.
Monumental sources, 2.
Mosaic authorship of Pentateuch, 8, 10, 22.
Moses, 2, 3, 9, 11, 13 f., 16, 17 f., 20 f., 22 f., 24 f., 26 f., 27 f., 28 f., 41 f.
Moses, a Bedouin ?, 125.
„ Language of, 88.

Name, 1, 59, 86, 87.
„ of Jahveh, 59 *et passim*.
Naucratis, 130.
Nehemiah, 40.
Niebuhr, 10.
Nippur, 92, 94.
Noah, 47 *passim*.

Objections (sundry) rebutted, 124 f.
Old Testament, 10, 12, 22, 29, 30 f., 37, 40 f.
Olivétan, 15, 75.
Osterwald, 15, 96.

P, 43, 44, 45 f., 47, 48, 56, 57 f.
Parrot, 19 (*n*).
Pentateuch, 2 *bis*, 8, 9, 11, 22, 25, 26 f., 29, 31, 33, 35.
Petrie (Professor), 130.
Pharaoh, 42 *passim*.
Phnouti, 54.
Phœnician, 102.
„ workmen, 107.
Pithecanthropi, 15.
Pope, 7.
Potiphar, 54, 55.
Pretensions, 5.
Priestly Code, 25, 26 f., 32, 39, 44, 58.
Priestly Code (age of), 77.
Principle (first), 12 f.
„ (second), 89 f.
„ (third), 132 f.
Psalm xxii. 1, 105.
Psalms, 40.
Psalter, 4.

Rachel, 18, 84.
"Rainbow" Bible, 31, 38, 52.
Rameses II., 93.
Rassam, 94.
Reading—high voice, 35.
„ —low „ 35.
Redactor, 26, 45, 56 f.
Redactors, 31.
Red Sea, 43.
Revue de l'Histoire des Religions, 86.

Sachau, 104.
Sagengeschichtsbuch, 46.
Saites, 104.
Samaria, 32.
Samaritan Pentateuch, 106, 113 f.
Sarah, 18 f.
Sargon, 92.
Scheil, 100.
Script, Aramaic, 98, 114.
„ Babylonian, 89.
„ Canaanite, 98, 110 f.
„ Cretan, 98.
„ Egyptian, 98.
„ Hebrew, 101, 110 f.
„ Samaritan, 114.
Septuagint, 24, 67, 68 f., 111 f.
Shaddai, 67, 68 f.
Shem, 55, 56.
Shem, 87.
Siloam Inscription, 105, 107.
Sinai, Mt. (institutions of), 119 f.
Skinner, 49.
Song of Roland, 9.
„ Solomon, 40.
Sumerian, 95, 97, 100.
Syene, 103, 104.

Tablet, second, 15 f.
Tel el-Amarna, 92 f., 94 f.
Tello, 94.
Temple (reconstruction of), 117.
Terah, 56.
Tetragrammaton, 65 *bis*, 66 *bis*, 69, 75, 79.
Thucydides, 27.
Tradition (Destruction of), 2 f.

Ur of the Chaldees, 18, 45 f. *et passim*.

Voltaire, 123.

Wellhausen, 43, 117.
Winckler, Dr., 93, 95.
Wolf, 10.
Writings of Moses, 3 *et passim*.

Zerubbabel, 117.

II. TEXTS

GENESIS

	PAGE
i.	12 f. *passim*
ii.	14 *passim*
ii. 4	14
ii. 9	15
ii. 18	15
iv. 26	65
x.	56
x.	135
x. 32	56
xii. 7	66
xv.	135
xv. 7	18
xv. 7	46
xv. 8	18
xvii.	44
xvii. 1	45
xvii. 5	67
xviii. 10	18
xix. 29	48
xxi. 33	66
xxii. 14	67
xxxii. 9	17
xxxii. 30	67
xxxv. 10, 15, 18	67
xxxix.	52
xxxix. 5	53
xxxix. 9	53
xl., xli.	54
xli. 45	67
xlix. 28	58

EXODUS

iii. 13, 14, 15, 16	60, 61, 62
iii., vi.	60
v. 1	54
vi. 2–4	65, 67, 69, 74
vii. 5, 17	70
xiv. 4, 18	70
xv. 26	71
xvi. 12	71

LEVITICUS

xii., xiv.	123

NUMBERS

	PAGE
xxxiv. 4, 16	68

DEUTERONOMY

xvii. 4	127
xxiv. 8	123

JUDGES

xii. 6	67

1 SAMUEL

v. 4, 5	112

EZRA

iii. 21	117
vi. 18	117

PSALM

xxii.	105

ISAIAH

xix. 18	103
xlii. 8	67

JEREMIAH

xxi. 21	70
xxiv. 7	71

EZEKIEL

i. 24	68
vi. 7–10	72
ix. 3	112
x. 4	112
x. 5	68
xx. 5	73
xxix. 10	73
xxx. 6	73
xxxiv. 14	73
xxxvi. 11	72
xxxvi. 22, 23	71
xxxix. 6	71

ZEPHANIAH

i. 9	112

III. GREEK TERMS

αἴθριον, 112.
ἀμαφέθ, 112, 113.
βαθμός, 112.
ἑβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ, 103.
ἑβραϊστί, 102.
ἐδήλωσα, 65.
θεοῦ, 68.
θεὸς αὐτῶν, 68.
θεοῦ σαδδαί, 68.
ἱκανός, 68.
LXX 1 Sam. (1 Kings) v. 4; 112, 113.
ὀφθέντι, 66.
παντοκράτωρ, 68.
πρόθυρον, 112.
πρόπυλα, 112.
ὤφθην, 64.

IV. HEBREW TERMS

אני יהוה, 67.
הספתן (*ter*), 112.
ירע, 70.
נגר, 67.

V. EGYPTIAN TERMS

Nouti, 54.
Phnouti, 54.

VI. BABYLONIAN TERMS

Hawa, 100.
Ti, 100.

PRINTED BY MORRISON AND GIBB LIMITED, EDINBURGH